PALESTINE BOOKS - No. 3

LIBERATION - NOT NEGOTIATION

by

AHMAD SHUKAIRY

Research Centre — Palestine Liberation Organization

Beirut — Lebanon

1966

LIBERATION - NOT NEGOTIATION

•

AHMAD SHUKAIRY

PALESTINE BOOKS - No. 3

LIBERATION - NOT NEGOTIATION

by

AHMAD SHUKAIRY

Chairman of the Executive Committee

Palestine Liberation Organization

Research Centre — Palestine Liberation Organization

Beirut — Lebanon

1966

PALESTINE BOOKS

Published by
The Research Center
of the Palestine Liberation Organization
606 Sadat St. — (No. 22)
Beirut, Lebanan
August 1966

P. L. O. Research Center

606 Sadat St. (No. 22)

Beirut - Lebanon

Established in February 1965

PUBLICATIONS

(1) «Palestine Chronology».

(2) «Facts and Figures» Series.

(3) «Palestine Essays» Series.

(4) «Palestine Monographs» Series.

(5) «Palestine Books» Series.

(6) «Palestine Maps» Series.

(7) «Special Research Papers» Series.

FOREWORD

This book contains the full texts of the three statements made in November 1963 by Mr. Shukairy, in his capacity then as Chairman of the Palestine Arab Delegation, before the Special Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly during its Eighteenth Regular Session.

The item on the agenda was entitled «Report of the Commission-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East». In making his observations on the Report, however, Mr. Shukairy discussed many of the essential aspects of the Palestine Question in its entirety. Of particular importance is his forceful advocacy of **the liberation of Palestine** as the only appropriate response to the Zionist occupation of a large part of that country — an objective which, since then, has been officially proclaimed in the Charter establishing the Palestine Liberation Organization, headed by Mr. Shukairy.

The first statement was made on 5 November 1963 at the 399th meeting of the Committee; the second, on 14 November, at the 407th meeting; and the third, delivered in two parts, was made on 19 November at the 412th & 413th meetings.

The texts printed in the following pages are published without alteration, exactly as they were delivered, recorded by the Secretariat of the United Nations, and printed in the Verbation Records of the Special Political Committee, A/SPC/PV. 399, 407, 412, and 413.

Beirut, Lebanon
31 July 1966

Research Center

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreward	7
First Statement	11
Second Statement	45
Third Statement : Part I	83
Part II	115

FIRST STATEMENT

Made before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly at its 399 th meeting, held on 5 November 1963, at 10 : 30 a. m.

(Source : U. N. Document
A / SPC / PV. 399)

Before addressing myself to this tragic problem — the problem of the Palestine refugees — I crave the Committee's indulgence to preface my statement with a few preliminary remarks which are pertinent to the subject-matter of the item now under consideration.

In the first place I should like to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the honourable house, our deep and sincere appreciation for granting us this hearing. The Palestine delegation would like to seize this occasion to put on record our gratification that the people of Palestine have been given this occasion to express their views on such a burning issue, so vital to their national cause. Technically speaking, we know we are here before this august body under a privilege based upon licence, and not in exercise of a right that pertains to a full-fledged Member of the United Nations. We know that ours, here, is a voice and not a vote, but in substance and in effect — and I daresay in the interests of world peace and security — we are here as of right, and in our own right.

In the most telling words of Mr. Davis, reiterated in his noble statement to the Committee yesterday afternoon, «the Palestine refugee problem has a bearing on the stability and peace of the Middle East, and hence on the stability and peace of the whole world». These are the sober words of Mr. Davis, your accredited servant in the area, your honoured agent in the area, and if they are true — and definitely they are true, without a shred of doubt — then we are here not only in our right but as an absolute necessity to preserve peace and stability not only in the area but also in the whole world at large — to quote the words of Mr. Davis, as they appeared in his statement yesterday. For we are the principal party, we, the Palestine delegation here in the United Nations, who are making our appearance in the United Nations for the first time at this session, and we represent the principal party, the people of Palestine, the legitimate owners of the country and the rightful possessors

of their homeland, their ancestors' homeland, for countless generations and since time immemorial. This is the Palestine delegation and these are the people of Palestine who now stand before this august body.

We are the principal party in the matter and it is the ultimate destiny of the people of Palestine which will determine the major issue before you which arises from this problem : war or no war, peace or no peace. This issue will be determined by the ultimate destiny of the people of Palestine, and their future.

On the other hand, let me remind this honourable house of the ringing proclamation of the Charter, addressed to all nations, large and small. In the very first pages of the Charter, in the preamble, Members are pledged as the United Nations to promote «the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples», «respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion». The Charter has further expressed determination «to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small». With these fundamental principles and lofty objectives in mind, it would therefore be a flagrant injustice to discuss the problem of the refugees in the absence of the people themselves, or to deny their status. I heard it said yesterday that we do not represent anybody. I make reference to no delegation, but it has been claimed, it has been said, that we represent no one. At most, we represent the refugees. But where are the people of Palestine ? Who does represent the people of Palestine ? It is my assertion that the Palestine delegation represents the people of Palestine, and we are here on our right, not by grace, and had the Charter of the United Nations been implemented rightly in 1947, we would have our seat here amongst you, the other representatives, as a full-fledged, fully independent and sovereign Member of the United Nations. But because the Charter was betrayed, we come to you as petitioners ; we come to you without a seat amongst you ; we come to you here as a grace but in fact because of the interests of international peace and security. We assert our presence here because we are the major factor that can make peace or war in the Middle East, and this depends upon the destiny and future of the refugees in general and the Palestine people as a whole. It is upon them that the whole future of the Middle East will be determined and decided.

The United Nations, we venture to submit, cannot adjudicate by default or in absentia. Even a justice of the peace cannot proceed in the absence of the party aggrieved. The United Nations, let me recall, is the highest international tribunal. It has been rightly described as the «Parliament of Man», and the destiny of man must therefore be decided in his presence, and not in his absence. This is not a rule of prudence, or an attribute of universality, towards which this Organization is heading. It is rather an elemental rule of justice, more so that the item that stands now before the Committee is the outcome of

the most flagrant injustice ever known in the annals of history, without a precedent and without parallel.

I beg you, M. Chairman, and members of the Committee, to take this pronouncement of mine as the whole truth, without any scintilla of exaggeration. Yes, Gentlemen, ours is the most tragic tragedy, without a precedent and with no parallel. Mr. Davis has told you in his report that the lot of the Palestine refugees constitutes a tragic page in human history. These are the words uttered not by an Arab's voice. These are not the indictments which come from Arab origins. This is the indictment of Mr. Davis himself, who speaks of this problem of the refugees as being a tragic page in human history. And what history ? Not medieval history, where one expects a tragic page ; not ancient history, where one expects a tragic page — and medieval and ancient history are full of tragedies and tragic chapters, not only pages — but this is a tragic page in human history, modern history, within the life of the United Nations, during the age of the United Nations, and to have this tragedy of this nature is a tragedy in itself, against United Nations authority and against the United Nations Charter — the lofty principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

What is really disastrous, and disastrous indeed, in this regard — and I would say, amounting to an insult to the intelligence of the United Nations — is that the Israeli delegation has contended from the rostrum of the United Nations that the Palestine problem does not exist at all. These are not my words. The Palestine problem as such does not exist at all — these are the sober and calculated words uttered in cold blood by the delegation of Israel in this hall, to this Assembly, from this very rostrum, Mr. Chairman, that the Palestine problem does not exist at all. The truth is that such an Israeli fallacy does not exist at all. Mr. Davis has referred to the Palestine problem as such on more than one occasion.

In the books of the United Nations, ever since 1947, the Palestine problem has figured prominently amongst all international problems. Moreover, should any testimony be needed to refute this Israeli delegation's distortion, the item before you is the testimony. Our meeting here, our assembling in this hall this morning is the very testimony of the existence of the Palestine problem. Were it not existing we would not have met in this hall to discuss the refugee problem, which is part and parcel of the Palestine question. To deny the very existence of the Palestine problem is a travesty to the United Nations and is an international mockery which is intolerable for the civilized world to hear. For a problem that has been in existence for the last fifteen years, with 1,200,000 refugees living in exile in tents and in camps after having been uprooted from their homelands and robbed of their possessions by Israel — to come here and have courage enough to state that there is no problem called «the Palestine question», is in my view fantastic and ridiculous and cannot be tolerated by the General Assembly as it would be much below the intelligence of the United Nations.

The item now deals with the problem — to be exact, let me quote the figures of Mr. Davis — of 1,210,170 refugees of Palestine. This is not the problem of refugees, this is a refugee nation in its totality. But it seems this human tragedy is too insignificant to Israel, too negligible to Israel, too trivial to Israel, to make an item before the United Nations or to prove the very existence of a problem entitled «the Palestine problem». We all recall that the Palestine question has led to a war in 1948, a tragic war, with all the afflictions and the throes of war, let alone the tripartite war of aggression in 1956; and still in spite of the war of 1948 and the aggression of 1956, Israel finds enough courage to come to the rostrum here to claim from this international forum that the Palestine question does not exist.

The truth, the vibrant truth, is that the Palestine problem exists in the United Nations and outside the United Nations and will continue to exist in the United Nations and outside the United Nations until the people of Palestine are repatriated to their homes and are repatriated to their homeland.

It is no wonder, however, that Israel should deny the very existence of the Palestine problem. Having uprooted the people from their land, robbed their homes, denied them the right of repatriation, it is easy, and quite easy, for Israel to deny the very existence of the Palestine problem.

I must, therefore, categorically state that as long as the Palestine problem exists in any manner and under any title, we shall be present here in the United Nations. United Nations presence, as you know, has become a United Nations practice to deal with the various international problems. We hear it said in the various Committees that for any international problem, the United Nations must assert its presence. United Nations presence has become an international practice. We must assert our presence in the United Nations. We shall come here to the United Nations through the gate of oppressed peoples until we get through the gate of fully sovereign States, with the whole of Palestine fully independent and fully sovereign.

I know that, to this grand mansion of the United Nations, there are two gates : one gate for fully sovereign and fully independent States where you get through with your full rights as a State, and another gate for oppressed peoples and nations through which we have come on this occasion and through which many of you, gentlemen, have come on previous occasions. Many statesmen of this Organization have come through the gate of oppressed peoples until their liberation was achieved and accomplished, until their statehood was recognized, until their full independence was achieved by a liberation movement. They have gone through those gates of oppressed peoples, through which we have come this time. On occasions in the future it is our hope that we will not come through the gates of oppressed nations and peoples. We will come through your gate, as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations to occupy our worthy seat here in the United Nations and to unseat our oppressor who has robbed our homeland and our homes.

I need hardly remind this Committee that the Palestine delegation does not make its appearance today as ordinary petitioners coming from a self-governing or non-self-governing territory. We have not come to rectify an error in a draft constitution, nor have we come to seek the release of political prisoners or put domestic matters in order. Neither have we come to seek redress against a violation of human rights, pure and simple. In the lifetime of this Organization this august body was seized with various complaints based on a violation of human rights particularly with respect to private individuals — and I stress, private individuals — the case of Mindszenty and the case of the eleven American airmen, just to bring to your memory only a few instances. On these occasions, you will recall, the Assembly went into acrimonious debate, into emotional discussion and into a hair-splitting deliberation. Most recently, on the question of the death of two Israeli farmers, the Security Council, with the exception of Morocco, with the exception of the Soviet Union, with the exception of Venezuela and probably of others whom I do not recollect, the Security Council almost stood up on tip-toe, so excited, it was a vehement excitement on the proceedings of the murder of two Israeli farmers.

But as to the present item, the item before you under consideration, let me warn with all earnestness and solemnity, that the problem does not belong to an individual or individuals. Neither does it disclose an ordinary violation of human rights. What is at stake is a whole people, a whole refugee nation, dispossessed of their ancestral homeland. The issue is not a violation — and I emphasize it is not a violation — it is a negation — of human rights, down to the base, down to the roots, down to the core of negation. The problems with which we are seized in the United Nations were violations of human rights in respect either of one individual or so many individuals. But what is at stake, what is posed here before the General Assembly, is not a violation, but an entire negation, the very absence, the very non-existence of human rights at all in their entirety. This is the gravity and intensity of the problem with which we are dealing at this session of the Assembly.

The issue involves the right inherent in every people to live in their homeland, just as the 110 nations represented in this Assembly live in their homeland. I have said 110 delegations, not out of error, not out of inadvertence, not out of forgetfulness, but I have said 110 delegations, here, represented in this Assembly with wilful intention because we do not recognize Israel, we do not recognize its existence, and as Mr. Davis had explained so ably and so eloquently here yesterday, we do not recognize that Israel is entitled to any rights, even to continue to exist.

These are not the sentiments of the Palestine delegation that are brought forward here, driven home to the minds of the Assembly. I invite your attention to the report of Mr. Davis, where he spoke of the feelings of all the people of the Arab world with regard to the existance of Israel. It was not sugar-

coated. There was no coating in this treatment by Mr. Davis. It was so vibrant and so glaring when he said in plain language that the Arab people — not just the politicians, not just the refugees, not just the people of Palestine, but the whole rank and file of the Arab people — in their homelands, from Morocco westward to Kuwait eastward, have this great, deep feeling, resentment and embitterment with regard to the very existence of Israel and the right of Israel to continue to exist. This is the gist of the statement by Mr. Davis. This is a man who does not live, as does the Conciliation Commission, behind closed doors, probably at the 38th or 32nd floor of the General Assembly. This is a man who has lived with the problem, himself, who has talked with the people in their camps. He has lived with this problem in his heart, and he comes here to tell you that this is a problem for all people, not for an official. These are the findings of a noble man, who has an objective outlook; not the findings of the Conciliation Commission, living frozen here, in one of the floors of the United Nations, who has submitted to the General Assembly its «progress» report. It is amazing to read that the title states «progress report». It is really a travesty to the United Nations to have such a title, the «twenty-first progress report», given by the Conciliation Commission. I assume that there are twenty « progress » reports preceding this one, but what progress has the Conciliation Commission effected ?

This is simply ridiculous. You sit over the mandate of the Palestine refugees of the resolution adopted in 1948. You issue twenty-one reports, claiming progress, and I think the title should be corrected. I am not allowed to offer an amendment here ; I am not representing a State, but I think that this should be rectified to read : «The twenty-first failure report of the Conciliation Commission», not «progress» report. We would be abusing the word «progress» in its genesis, with all its connotations, with all its meanings, when we claim that this is the twenty-first «progress» report, and for every «progress» report had the Conciliation Commission been able to repatriate one refugee, then I could report before this Committee that twenty-one of our people, twenty-one refugees, have been repatriated through the efforts of the Conciliation Commission.

Paragraph II of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) has asked the Conciliation Commission since 1948 «to facilitate the repatriation... of the refugees», whether or not Israel wills it; and here comes the United Nations Conciliation Commission, at the eleventh hour, at the door of the General Assembly, to create a special atmosphere under which the Committee is to work and to function in a frozen atmosphere, to claim to say that it is the twenty-first «progress» report. How can it have this courage, this bravery, here in the United Nations, where people understand words and their connotations? We do not understand this. We have dictionaries in the United Nations library where we can discover what «progress» means.

This is truly regrettable : that a United Nations agency should assume that the work of the Conciliation Commission over the past fifteen years has

been one of progress. It could be progress, the progress of failure, of frustration, and a miserable failure, indeed. In this respect, I agree with the Conciliation Commission that it had been a progress, but a progress in deterioration, a progress of failure, in desperation. This is the progress which we can understand. No other meaning is understandable, no other meaning should be receivable by this house.

By the very nature of the problem, we assert our presence in the United Nations as of right, in the very interests of international justice and the dictates of world peace and stability. With the United Nations Charter in mind as the highest international code, it is our sacred right to be heard, and it is your sacred duty to hear.

In the second place, and this is my second representation, I feel it is necessary to tell the Committee what this Palestine delegation is, to which reference was yesterday made. What is this Palestine delegation ? A word or two in this regard will give you a better appraisal of the report of Mr. Davis on the matter, and a better understanding of the statement which Mr. Davis made here yesterday, for in a sense the Palestine delegation, its composition and its membership, are the real living characters of the report of Mr. Davis.

I shall not refer to myself, for I am not a newcomer to the United Nations. I had served as chairman of the Syrian delegation for a number of years, and I had served as chairman of the Saudi Arabia delegation for a number of years, also. These seats are both occupied by my worthy friends and brethren.

I have always disclosed myself as a refugee and I disclose myself again as a refugee. I have never been ashamed to do so, nor am I ashamed to stand up in daylight and disclose myself as a refugee. The shame lies at the doors of the imperialist Powers, which made of myself and of my countrymen a refugee nation. So that as it may, let me turn to my colleagues on the Palestine delegation.

To begin with, I should like to tell the Committee that all my colleagues are Palestinians, down to their very core, down to the bone, to the nerve. Flesh and blood, they are Palestinians. They were born and lived in the Holy Land, the land of their fathers and forefathers, since time immemorial. The Committee can be sure that they are not emigrees, who entered the country under the British bayonets. Likewise, let me assure the Committee that my colleagues are not aliens to the land, strangers to its people, or colonizers from all corners of the globe, who came to the country in an ocean of American financial assistance. No. They are lawful citizens of Palestine, rooted to its soil, and deeply attached to its history. Their homes are their own, and I should like the Committee to understand the connotation of «their own».

Their farms are their possession. Their orchards, they have planted themselves. Their mosques and churches, they have established with their fathers and grandfathers. Their towns and villages are their toil and, I repeat, are the

toil and the sweat of their ancestors. They have dispossessed none ; we have dispossessed none, and none we have robbed. We are the victims of the most degrading international robbery. I will not name the robber. He is too well known to be named. Neither will I ask his condemnation, for the Great Man Moses has condemned him : Thou shalt not rob thy neighbour — and from thy mouth ye shall be condemned.

As to their domicile, my colleagues come from different parts of Palestine. Some come from Jerusalem, wherein lies the church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Mosque of Omar, in living testimony to the national fraternity of the Moslems and Christians of Palestine, a fraternity reflected in the composition of our delegation. Some others come from Galilee and you know what is Galilee — those of you who had been taught the New Testament in their childhood in school ; you know what is Galilee and the holiness of Galilee, which has witnessed the miracles of the Great Master, Jesus Christ. Others have come from the South with its ancient pilgrimage routes to the Holy Places in Mecca. Others come from the Coast — the historic crossroads to the three continents of the world. We all come from Palestine — we are all Palestinians .. now and for all time to come. After 1948, many of us have changed residence, have changed addresses ; many acquired different identity cards, different passports and different occupations and ways and walks of life. Amongst my colleagues we have two distinguished ladies quite prominent in women's movements. Two they are, but they are more than two. Amongst my colleagues we have an ex-minister, we have members of Parliament, we have a Head of the Bar Association, we have a farmer, we have a land owner, we have a doctor, we have a mayor, and we have a London barrister who came straight from London. But we remain Palestinians, all in all, refugees first and foremost, except that destiny has decreed that we are not on the rolls of Mr. Davis.

This is what distinguishes the Palestine delegation in its present composition from 1,200,000 refugees living in camps. We are all refugees that breathe the same national aspirations, that are haunted with nostalgia for our homes and homeland with the one and only difference that we are not being supported by Mr. Davis, not supported by international charity. We still keep our dignity and we are not living on charity. It is only destiny; otherwise we would have been on the rolls of Mr. Davis, living in camps and unable to have our voice heard by the Assembly. Destiny has decreed that we should not be on the roll, but that the Assembly should know and be sure that the aspirations of us all as Palestinians are one and the same : the unshakable determination to go back to our home and to go back to our homeland in dignity and in honour.

The Palestine delegation is drawn from the Palestinians in Jordan, in Gaza, in Syria, in Lebanon, in Libya and also from North and South America. We come from different countries in the Arab world, but we are one, one in all and all in one, devoted to Palestine until the last breath of our life. So it is with all our fellow countrymen, wherever they may be, whether they live in

tents, camps, caves or towns and villages.

We are twenty in number, seemingly large for a delegation. But this is, again, a little phenomenon of the tragedy in which we live. This is another aspect of the tragedy and disaster into which we have fallen. Our people have been dispersed far and wide in the Arab world, and wide representation is in keeping with our wide dispersal.

But scattered as we may be, we come to you in one delegation, representing one people for one Palestine, free and undivided, independent and unpartitioned ; and herein lies the solution of the Palestine refugee problem, a solution based on the unity of the Holy Land — and I emphasize the unity of the Holy Land because it cannot be a Holy Land if it is partitioned; holiness is indivisible. When I speak of home and homeland, I must emphasize that I am not injecting notions alien to the item, nor am I attempting to implant issues foreign to the deliberations. Home and homeland are the very landmarks highlighted by Mr. Davis, the Commissioner-General of the Agency, in his report under the current discussion. Mr. Davis referred to the « grave injustice done to the refugees, through the loss of their homes and homeland». Thus the loss of homes and homeland is the crux of the problem before the Committee. Indeed, relief. shelter, vocational training, medical services and social welfare, although necessary in the daily life of the refugee, should be considered as ancillary to the problem. They are marginal aspects of the problem. But the central, the crucial and the vital is the home for the individual and the homeland for the people. This is the real issue that stands before the Committee. In fact, this is the real issue that stood before the United Nations ever since it was seized of the problem. You can be sure, Mr. Chairman, it will continue to be the outstanding issue before the United Nations for all time to come, until the refugees go back to their homes, go back to their homeland. It was this premise that led Mr. Davis to state in his report :

> «... the picture drawn in the annual reports for the past four years of the status and plight of the Palestine refugees, ... their state of mind and emotions, remains generally true». **(A/5513, para. 3)**

These words by Mr. Davis, couched in general terms, I beg to submit, go to betray impatience. The impatience of Mr. Davis was disclosed by him yesterday when he informed the Assembly of his resignation.

This resignation is not an achievement of the mandate of Mr. Davis. We know that an agency can be terminated when something is achieved, when the work is done and finished. But Mr. Davis' resignation is not the result of an achievement, or an act finished. It is because of impatience. And what is this impatience ? What are the reasons for the impatience of Mr. Davis ? For so many reasons he cannot disclose them. But we, the people of Palestine, can search the mind and heart of Mr. Davis to find out the reason for his impatience after his noble services for five consecutive years. He comes to the Assembly impatient to declare his resignation. This is not a resignation due to

an achievement, but a resignation due to non-achievement; not a resignation due to progress, as the Conciliation Commission claims, but a resignation due to failure — and to progressive failure. I beg to submit that Mr. Davis' impatience has been disclosed in his report. Mr. Davis is fed up, as we must have learned from his statement yesterday. Mr. Davis is sick and tired of the whole question that has been entrusted to him.

That is why he decided to refer you to his four previous reports **in toto.** On the part of Mr. Davis, we feel that this is a revolting attitude against Israeli defiance and, what is more, against Israeli continued defiance.

In his present report, Mr. Davis, while corroborating his previous reports, makes a most terrifying pronouncement, a pronouncement to this Assembly; it is an ultimatum, a final warning, by Mr. Davis before he quits the job with a clear conscience and independent mind. He has decided to serve an ultimatum, a warning, to the Assembly in a few words, saying that the Palestine refugee problem is as intractable as ever. After fifteen years of relentless effort by Mr. Davis and his predecessors, Mr. Labouisse and Mr. Blandford and a whole list of distinguished directors, Mr. Davis comes to the Assembly to say that the problem is as intractable as ever. This is the final warning and the final ultimatum served to the Assembly, and which makes the statement of the Conciliation Commission most ridiculous when it says that the problem is in the direction of progress and that the talks conducted on the higher level are under way, and that they are being held in the best of atmospheres. This is refuted by the ultimatum of Mr. Davis when he said that the problem remains as intractable as ever. And it would have been more honest for the Conciliation Commission to follow the lines of Mr. Davis' honesty — to come to the Assembly here and say that the problem is as intractable as ever due to the defiance of Israel and the arrogance of Israel by not implementing the resolutions of the General Assembly which have been reiterated and reaffirmed by the General Assembly for the last fifteen years. This would have been more in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations — for the Conciliation Commission to have followed the footsteps of Mr. Davis and to have said that «We have failed, and the failure is conditioned and reasoned by the defiance and the consistent and persistent rebellion of Israel, because they have not even accepted the very principle of the United Nations rsolution for repatriation».

You all recall that the Conciliation Commission early in its third report, paragraph 13, offered to say that Israel had not even accepted the principle of repatriation. And the Conciliation Commission comes here after fifteen years and says that everything is quiet on the Western Front. And we have quiet diplomacy ; that is why it is quiet on the Western Front — I do not know what front it is; is it west or east or somewhat where out in the stratosphere ?

These recitals from the report of Mr. Davis make it abundantly clear that the problem before you is primarily one of home and the homeland. In essence

it is not a problem of rations; it is not a problem of sugar, soap and oil, or the refugees. It is a problem of our national existence. First and foremost, to be or not to be is the problem. That is the gist of Mr. Davis' report. And I must declare here and now that Mr. Davis is one of the few public figures in the United States — and I say the United States for the hearing of the delegation of the United States; so loudly I say it — who resists Zionist pressure, with an unshakable determination to think and act and report with an independent mind and objectivity.

I make this remark without any reflection upon the people of the United States — even those who have taken the liberty to laugh in the gallery, who are a section of the people of the United States. I have no complaints at all against the people of the United States. The people of the United States deserve our admiration for their benevolence, for their tolerance and for their fairness. But it is the policy of the United States which is my point. Watching the television, hearing the radio, reading the press, listening to the statements of senators, of congressmen, of governors, here in the United States and particularly on the question of the refugees, and more particularly in the course of the debates in the General Assembly, makes us believe that Israel is here and here is Israel, that simply glided across the ocean to be stationed here in New York. That is our impression which we gain when we listen to all this bombastic propaganda, with all its fire-works, statements from all sides, from different parties, from the Senate, from the Congress : defeating the humanitarian aspect of the refugees' problem. It establishes an atmosphere of frustration, makes the people of Palestine believe that we are not in the United States ; we are in Israel that has simply glided across the ocean and stationed its headquarters here in New York next to the mansions of the United Nations — and it is with God's blessing that we have a place here with immunities and privileges, even for those who are petitioners and not the accredited delegations of the United Nations. It is God's blessing that we have on the East River here this international mansion where we can speak our minds so freely, although it could be suppressed the next morning by the radio, by the television, by the newspapers, and perhaps also deflected by senators and congressmen, defeating the position of the refugees — for life and death, for their national cause.

This is how it is, and it should be said in the Parliament of man — here in the only place where the refugees can state their case, can speak their conscience, their minds. The refugees have no congressmen to approach. They have no senators to talk to. They do not have Mr. Truman, who once said that he did not have Arabs in his constituency. We have none, except this United Nations, this civilized world, and we have faith in the international community, who, in the long run, will see justice and will undo the «justice» that has befallen our people and made the whole nation a refugee nation — not a section of us, but all the people are refugees. In the age of the United Nations, it is an insult to humanity; it is an insult to humanity to have a whole people

uprooted from their homeland, clamouring for 15 years to go back to their home, with the United Nations General Assembly reaffirming one session after the other : repatriation, but with no repatriation; with a perpetuation of a life of exile. This should not take place in the life-time of the United Nations.

I need not parade before you a lengthy line of precedent or jurisprudence to support our right to live. We are entitled to live as you are entitled to live. There is no distinction in this world of ours, over this planet, between peoples large and small; and no discrimination should be made on the basis of sex, religion or language. Because we are Asian, because we are Palestinians, there should be no discrimination against our very existence, against our right to live and to live in our homeland.

I shall not put a lengthy line before you of all jurisprudence and precedents in support of our right to exist, our right to live, our right to be in our homes and our homeland. And let me remind you, gentlemen, that the notion of home is the oldest, the most ancient, of the notions in the world. When man was almost a beast he had a house in the trunk of a tree; he had a house amongst the stones; he had a house in a cave. This is the most ancient notion known in history: before civilization, before the League of Nations and before the United Nations, man had the right to live in a home, whether it be in a cave or the trunk of a tree. This is the most ancient notion, and we invoke our right to live in our homes in our homeland.

We want to enjoy what you enjoy in your homes, to exercise whatever rights you exercise in your homeland. We are people as you are; and as you have asserted national self-determination, we aspire to exercise our right to national self-determination. We aspire to exercise our right, and justice is indivisible. The United Nations cannot preach non-discrimination and then act in a discriminatory manner.

The people of Palestine should be one with the other nations to enjoy the sacred principles enshrined in the Charter. It is this universality to which a great man — a man whom you love, a man whose words are preached as gospel, whose conduct and behaviour in life are taken as a universal guide for human conduct — by the name of John Donne referred when he said : «Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee». These are the noble words of a noble creature of humanity. Applied to the refugees, these noble words would mean — and it could equally be said : Any man's exile is my exile because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the rations go, the rations go for thee.

This is no rhetoric simile; this is no melancholic inference. It could take place as a reality any time, any place and against any nation — and, God forbid, against any nation represented here in this Assembly. If world order is to be based on caprice, defiance and sheer power, any people can be uprooted,

dispossessed and their country obliterated, to use the term of Mr. Davis as literally appearing in his report.

And let me say with due courtesy to each and all that, if the Palestine refugees are not entitled to their homes or to their homeland, no other nation is entitled to anything; and international life would be floating in chaos and disorder. I beg your leave to state the reasons.

Palestine is an ancient land, not a virgin land of a new discovery. All throughout history Palestine has never been vacant; it has been inhabited and populated by its people beyond human memory. We are its people since time immemorial. Even the Book of Books, which is always invoked by the Israeli delegation, refers to our land as the land of Canaan of the Arabian Peninsula — Canaan the Arab, who migrated from the Arabian Peninsula — just as it refers to the ancient Hebrew as a stranger. This is the utterance of the Book of Books, the Holy Scriptures, the Old Testament : «The land wherein thou are a stranger ... the land of Canaan». This is the homeland of the refugees to whom Mr. Davis has often referred with sympathy and human affection.

The people of Palestine, to which the refugees belong, have lived their lives in their ancient land and shared with the rest of the world the joys and afflictions that befell all peoples in ancient, medieval and modern times. Our country was overrun by the Assyrians, by the Babylonians, by the Hebrews, by the Greeks, by the Romans, by the Persians, by the Seljukes and, lastly, by the Ottomans. Thus, the country has changed hands, but we were subjected to invasions and we repelled invasions. That was our history, a history of invasions, a history of repelling invasions, repelling aggressors. We remained the people of the land : we acquired diverse cultures, languages and traditions, until we emerged, at least for the last thirteen centuries, an Arab society, participating with the rest of the world in making Arab civilization and, indeed, Arab history. Such has been the record of Palestine and the people of Palestine.

Thus, when Dr. Davis refers to the embittered feeling of the refugees, the Palestine people and the Arab peoples in general, it is against this background that one should fathom the embitterment and the resentment in the region. Resentment and embitterment, I should say, are very gentle, very soft and very weak words to describe the passions and emotions of the Arab people because of the destruction of the national life of the people of Palestine.

However, it should not be taken as a suppression of fact that I have omitted mention of the Jewish presence in the life of Palestine. The question of a Jew or non-Jew was never an issue in our national life. Native Jews were simply Palestinians, just as the Moslems and Chirstians in the country. As in all Arab countries, the Jews were never a problem. In Palestine, they lived in amity, peace and prosperity. It is a fact of history that, when Jews were

persecuted, massacred, elsewhere, they found a hospitable refuge in the Arab world, and Palestine was included.

Beginning with the Middle Ages, Palestine became a secure haven for many religious Jews; the country received them with open arms. There was no idea of establishing a State, no idea of expelling the indigenous people, seizing their towns and villages and robbing their properties. So it was that a hearty welcome was extended to the Jews in keeping with Arab chivalry and in keeping with Arab hospitality. These are the facts of history which no one can deny and which no one can ignore.

In Jerusalem, for instance, we are told by Obadiah, a distinguished Jew and scholar, that, in the fifteenth century, Jewish families did not exceed seventy in number — no more than seventy families in Jerusalem :

In its report to the British Parliament, the Royal Commission of Enquiry on Palestine stated that, in 1845, in the whole of Palestine there were not more than 12,000 Jews. In 1882, there was only one Jewish colony in Palestine.

Amongst the first refugees that were admitted into Palestine some 1,500 came from Hungary and Holland. They were followed by 400 from Lithuania. The stream of refugees went on until by the end of World War I the Jews numbered 60,000, owning only 2 per cent of the land and enjoying the fraternity, hospitality and chivalry of the Arab people in Palestine. This is the stream of refugees that has been coming into Palestine as the last haven, as a secure shelter, for the persecuted Jews.

In diametrical contradiction to the statement by the delegation of Israel with regard to the Jewish streams of refugees, one from Europe into Palestine, the other from Palestine outside Europe — refugees from the Arab world — these are citizens, these are worthy inhabitants of the Arab world who lived unmolested, with open arms and open hearts. They were whipped by Zionism, whipped by Israel to migrate — there was no persecution. There was no reason for the Jews in Iraq or for the Jews in Syria — and for that matter in the United Arab Republic or in Tunisia, or in Morocco or anywhere else in the Arab world — to leave. They were treated with chivalry and with benevolence. There was no reason except with the rise and emergence of Israel whipping every Jew, not only in the Middle East, but in the whole world. As Mr. Ben-Gurion once said every Jew who lives outside of Israel has violated the Jewish religion. He who lives outside of Israel is not a Jew. It is this stream doctrine which has brought the Jews from the Arab world into Israel. There was no persecution at all. This is simply ridiculous. It is a distortion. It is a misrepresentation of fact. They still live in our homeland, in various parts of the Arab fatherland. There were Jewish ministers, there were members of Parliament who were Jews, there were Jewish journalists. In every walk of life in the Arab world you find Jews, and we still have them. But Israel has persecuted these Jews, the Arab Jews, in order to get them to migrate into Israel.

There was no reason to have two streams. That stream has been manufactured by Israel itself. But this stream, this tragic stream which was caused by terror and bloodshed is the stream of the Arab refugees' exodus from Palestine, and who live now in exile. This is the only stream of the exodus of refugees.

I say that the Jews have enjoyed our fraternity for even Mr. Ben-Gurion — who was Prime Minister of Israel for a number of years — and Mr. Ben-Zvi, the last President of the Republic of Israel — these two leading figures of Israel, in World War I, expressed to Jemal Pasha, the commander-in-chief in Syria and Palestine — and my distinguished colleague from Turkey will tell you who Jemal Pasha, that prominent figure of World War I of the Arab Middle East was — their gratitude to the Arab countries, which gave their people shelter for hundreds of years, as unforgettable Mr. Ben-Gurion and Mr. Ben-Zvi expressed to the commander-in-chief in Syria and Palestine their gratitude for the hospitality of the Arabs as being unforgettable. It is ironic, tragic and paradoxical, that these two Jewish refugees should cause the exodus of the very same people who afforded them refuge and shelter, when they had been refused shelter and refuge elsewhere. This is the paradox, this is the tragedy, for two leading refugees of the Jews, sheltered in our homeland, to be the very cause and very reason for our people to be refugees.

Even after the Zionist invasion of Palestine in 1948, Jews in the Arab World continued to live free and unmolested. Rabbi Elmer Berger of the United States, in his book entitled. «Those Who Know Better Must Say So» quoted a letter written to him by a well-known Jew, Mr. Elias Cohen, wherein he said that «Arabs and Jews have always enjoyed in this country complete freedom, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of trade and freedom of commerce ... as a matter of fact, Jews here have never felt anti-semitism or discrimination ».

That statement by Rabbi Elmer Berger simply contradicts the fallecy that was made by the Israeli delegation with regard to the stream of Jews from the Arab world into Israel.

I bring these matters to your attention, Mr. Chairman, not to arouse your sympathy or mercy for the refugees, but to explain the sentiments of embitterment and resentment amongst the refugees as reported by the Commissioner-General of the Agency. We have not come here to seek mercy or charity. We seek our inherent right, repatriation to our homes and homeland. And if we cannot regain our homeland within the United Nations, or regain it without, certainly, we do not deserve it, nor do we deserve our being, we the people of Palestine, and the Arab people as a whole.

I speak in these impassioned terms for this is the minimum of human reaction to this gross and flagrant injustice inflicted upon a whole people, an injustice second to none in the annals of history.

Ever since the United Nations was seized with this problem, the General Assembly, session after session, has decreed the repatriation of the refugees. In his report to this session Mr. Davis refers to the 1948 resolution with regard to repatriation as follows :

> « ... this resolution, which was adopted in December 1948 and has been reaffirmed by the Assembly in each of its fourteen succeeding sessions, still remains unimplemented». **(A/5513, p. 1)**

This statement, most objective, on the part of Mr. Davis, is tantamount to an indictment against the United Nations, let alone Israel. I dare say, it is already a verdict against the integrity of the United Nations, exposing its authority.

For the last fifteen years, the United Nations has been reiterating its position in support of repatriation, but not a single refugee has been repatriated. The United Nations sought the good offices of the United Nations mediator, Count Bernadotte, but the mediator was killed by the Israelis, in the course of his noble mission, in Jerusalem. Subsequently, the United Nations established the Palestine Conciliation Commission with a specific mandate for the repatriation of the refugees. But the twenty-one progress reports of this organ have shown no progress. All the reports of the Commission have revealed a rebellious attitude on the part of Israel, and declared quite plainly that Israel does not accept the very principle of repatriation. The defiance of Israel does not call for evidence, for Israel is on record here in the United Nations openly denying the Palestine refugees their right to repatriation. Mr. Davis reports this year that «the problem of the Palestine refugees remains as intractable as ever».

The Palestine delegation, and our people, view the matter very seriously. Indeed we cannot wait and sit indefinitely. There is a limit to our patience, and the self-restraint of any nation — any nation — is not without bounds and not without limits. When human patience is exhausted, man is bound to succomb to the counsel of desperation, and we know of United Nations experience where desperation leads. The United Nations is fully aware of the liberation movements that emerged and are still emerging in Asia and in Africa. Palestine could be the scene of a liberation movement and no one should be caught by surprise, for Palestine is our homeland and repatriation is our right — our inherent right.

I must make it quite plain and clear to the United Nations that repatriation is our vested right. It is our God-given right for those who believe in God — and our natural right for those who believe in nature. Repatriation is not the innovation or the making of the General Assembly in its resolutions. The 1948 resolution calling for repatriation has simply declared the right, simply recognized the right, but repatriation existed before the United Nations and our right to our homeland pre-existed the existence of Israel, and repatriation,

therefore, should be our inherent right. We were in our homeland for countless generations, long before the existence of Israel. We pre-existed this illegitimate existence of Israel.

But, even without the United Nations resolution we are entitled to repatriation, without qualification — without reservation. We are entitled to go back to our homeland — to live our national life in dignity, human decency, and in larger freedom.

If I speak with embitterment and resentment, this is only human and natural — and Mr. Davis has aptly referred to our embitterment and resentment.

Many of the delegation sitting in this hall have in the past spoken the same language, with the same embitterment, as we speak, with the same resentment as we speak. Many of our African, Asian and Latin American friends have gone through the same ordeal, the same trials, as we are undergoing; they have fought for their country, for their liberty. Many have come to the United Nations as petitioners and observers, as we do. They were granted the same hearing, in spite of the protestations of the colonial Powers. In fact, no less than eighty Members of this Organization have won their freedom from the grip of colonial Powers. Our problem — to boil it down to its genesis — is a colonial issue, but in its most deadly manifestation. Indeed, the problem of the Palestine refugees is the outcome of imperialism and colonialism, with all its evils put together and combined. In Asia and Africa, imperialism was a foreign domination; it was an alien exploitation. But the peoples, the native peoples, remained in their homes, remained on their farms, remained on their land. No doubt all sorts of hardships, acts of repression and displacement were inflicted upon our brethren in Asia and in Africa, but here the native people in Palestine were uprooted, dispossessed and thrown out of their country by aliens, strangers, just like the **colons** who settled in Asia and in Africa. That is what makes the problem of the Palestine refugees of a unique character, more grievous than all the colonial issues that confronted the United Nations, because the Palestine problem has been beclouded by the highly organized and highly financed Zionist propaganda.

It may sound strange to you, Gentlemen, that the Palestine problem is the outcome of imperialism. There can be no better authority than Sir Winston Churchill to prove this imperialistic and colonialistic design which brought about the refugee problem, and Sir Winston Churchill is the last living architect of imperialism and of the British Empire, but he did not live to liquidate the British Empire. He still survives and Great Britain survives. In outlining his dream and his scheme for the establishment of a Jewish State, Sir Winston Churchill stated as follows :

«If, as may well happen, there should be created in our lifetime by the banks of the Jordan» — not only in Palestine but on both sides of the Jordan

— «a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four million Jews, an event will have occurred which would especially be in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire».

This is the language of the British Empire, the voice of imperialism and colonialism, spoken by Sir Winston Churchill, the last imperialist in our modern world. No better testimony can be afforded to the General Assembly to prove that the refugee problem is an imperialist problem, not a by-product but a main product of the alliance between Zionism and imperialism and colonialism. If this statement means anything — and it is pregnant with meaning — it is imperialism by definition, and a refugee problem must, by necessity, be in store with this abominable goal of importing millions of Jews, not just to Palestine but along the banks of Jordan.

In this regard, it is noteworthy to recall that even the Zionist leaders have never concealed the fact that Zionism is an imperialist movement. We have it on record that a leading Zionist figure, who was lobbying — as many Zionists in the United States do, in the lobbies of the Congress — with the British Cabinet, wrote to David Wolfson, Herzl's successor, the leader of the Zionist movement, saying :

«I did my best to convince Lord Milner that what he called imperialism is identical with Zionism».

This is the admission of a leading Zionist figure, when he says that Zionism and imperialism are identical and he was doing everything to convince Lord Milner that imperialism and Zionism go hand in hand. This is no evidence; this is a confession — an incriminating confession that Zionism and imperialism are two sides of one and the same coin. This theme has been detailed in actual terms by Dr. Weizmann himself and the details, as you will see, Mr. Chairman, constitute the rudiments of the refugee problem — a refugee problem in embryo. In Weizmann's archives the following document has been discovered — a recent document in the archives of Dr. Weizmann, in Israel, has been discovered. The discovery of this document shows us that there was an interview between Dr. Weizmann and Lord Balfour on 4 December 1918. It reads as follows :

«... a community of four or five million Jews in Palestine would be a sufficiently sound economic basis from which the Jews could radiate out into the Near East and so contribute mightily to the reconstruction of countries which were once flourishing ... But all this presupposes free and unfettered development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine ... so that we should be able to settle in Palestine about four to five million Jews within a generation and so make Palestine a Jewish country under the British Crown ... ».

These notions of radiating out into the Middle East, of the reconstruction of countries, are the notions of colonialism. This is the **mission sacrée** often

invoked to justify imperialism in Asia and in Africa. This is the language of colonialism and imperialism which was addressed to our brethren in Asia and in Africa; and to import four to five million Jews into Palestine constitutes the genesis of the problem of the Palestine refugees. Once one brings millions of Jews to the tiny little country of Palestine, with 10,000 square miles, one is bound to expel the native people from their country, and this is where we are — 2 million Jews in Palestine and 1 million Arab refugees outside Palestine. This is the scheme of Dr. Weizmann, as recently discovered in his archives.

Thus, although the Arab exodus from Palestine actually started in 1948, as a result of Jewish terrorism, the refugee problem was lying in wait long before. It was a potential refugee problem lurking in the wake of Zionism. When the opportune moment for Zionism came in 1948, two events took place: the emergence of Israel and the emergence of the refugee problem. This is rather a geometric equation. Israel means a refugee problem, and no Israel means no refugee problem — and, indeed, no insecurity and no instability for the Middle East, and for the whole world at large.

Hence the problem of the Palestine refugees does not bear any resemblance to any refugee problem in the world, either in number or in nature — to any refugee problem in the world, I again say, either in number or in nature. In number our refugees are over one half of our population. Over one half of our people are exiles. No other refugee problem has come up to this proportion. In other countries they represent a fraction of a fraction, even in World War I and World War II.

Applying the Palestine refugee proportion to a country with 50 million people — and there are many countries in the Assembly here with 50 million people — the refugee problem would mean 25 million refugees. Just imagine the dimensions of the disaster, my dear brethren. I have omitted countries with hundreds of millions of population. Think of it — God forbid — should the tragedy befall your people. Then you would know why our people are haunted with nostalgia and desperation, with embitterment and resentment and, what is more, with a determination to emancipate their homeland.

Many members of this Committee have come only for the session. Some are Permanent Representatives but others have come for the session only. They know what homesickness means. Just think of their longing for their country, for their home, their children, their friends, and their longing for life at home. Think of it in our case.

Ours is not as short a trip as yours. We have not come for the Assembly alone and we do not go back to our homes after the session. It has been a long journey of fifteen years, away from the country we have loved so dearly, the country we have made so beautiful and fruitful with our sweat and with our labour, the country we have consecrated with our prayers, the country we have treasured with our culture, and lastly, the country wherein we have left the

graves of our beloved — our fathers, our mothers, our sisters, and the dearest, who passed away in their tender years of life.

I am not lamenting, I am not bewailing our destiny. I am simply portraying the life of the refugees in all its realities. In our case, emotions and passions are the heart of reality that throb with reality. Your emotions would be fiery, if, God forbid, you were denied the very seat you now occupy, and be seated where we are seated. As to the nature of the refugee problem, let me say outright that it stands on a different plane from any other refugee problem in the whole world. Human history has related various causes for a refugee problem — any refugee problem. War had been one major reason, religious persecution was another and civil strife was still another reason.

But the Palestine refugee problem stands unique. Our question is entirely different. It is not the outcome of religious dissension between Jews on one side and Christians and Moslems on the other side. It is not the result of a social or political conflict. We do not represent the Left and they do not represent the Right. It is not a conflict of ideology on social, economic or doctrinal matters, nor is it the product of a boundary dispute, or even of an armed conflict. It is much more than that and very much deeper than that.

The central factor for our refugee status is our non-existence as a people. I say our non-existence in the eyes of those who held world power in their hands. We do not exist in their eyes as a people. To them we do not exist as a people and our country is the ownership of none. When the Balfour Declaration was issued on 2 November 1917 by the British Government promising the establishment of a Jewish national home, our country was assumed to be a vacant land, and our people were assumed to be non-existent. This is the hotbed where the refugee problem was born and raised. Britain promised a land it did not possess and it did not own, and we who possessed, we who owned were not consulted. We were not asked. And in spite of that we protested and we went into rebellion, into war against the Balfour Declaration. But it was done as though our country was a British overseas possession that could be promised to any people without consultation with the rightful people; as though we were a possession overseas, as one of the gems in the British Crown — which we were not. It was therefore axiomatic that we become refugees when our country was swarmed with aliens and strangers from every creed and race.

Thus, to be fair, we must take the Balfour Declaration as the first report on the Palestine refugees. Count Bernadotte's report on the Palestine refugees is the first to be found in the archives of the United Nations. But it would be more equitable and comprehensive that we extend a request to the British Government, to the authorities of the British Museum wherein is deposited the original text of the Balfour Declaration, that this shameful document be transferred to the United Nations as the first instrument that led to this human drama, this human tragedy.

Again, when the United States subscribed to the Balfour Declaration, it did so on the assumption that we do not exist as a people. It did so — the United States did so — as though Palestine was a no man's island off the shores of the United States. It was also axiomatic that we should become refugees, for an alien, a stranger, can only be settled in any country by displacement, let alone expulsion and extermination.

And both Great Britain and the United States have assumed our non-existence when they endorsed the establishment of a Jewish State and the policy of Jewish immigration into Palestine without paying due regard to the wishes of the inhabitants of the country. In the course of the British mandate, some 700,000 Jews were imported into Palestine under British bayonets and through United States dollars; such a large influx of immigration against the will of the inhabitants is nothing but an invasion quite unique in modern history. It was therefore a necessary corollary that we become refugees, for no account was taken of our existence. We did not exist in the eyes of the United States, neither did we exist in the eyes of the British Empire although they had plenty of vision and wide eyes to see and to look. But still, we were not visible, we did not exist in the eyes of the United States and Great Britain.

When Uganda — and this is simply for history, and I say that with all due respect and admiration to the delegation, to the people, to the Government of Uganda — was suggested as a Jewish national home by Great Britain, Uganda's High Commissioner and its European residents protested. The project was rejected and Uganda was saved from this catastrophe and in fact spared from a refugee problem. It is with God's blessing that now we have Uganda as a fully independent and sovereign State, well represented by its able delegation, with no refugee problem. Had the High Commissioner not protested, had the European community in Uganda not persisted, there would have been a refugee problem in Uganda. But it is God's blessing that Uganda has been spared this tragedy, this disaster. They come here to occupy their worthy seat, so ably, in the United Nations.

I am labouring this point of non-existence not as a point of history, not for academic research, but because until yesterday we do not seem to be existing in this world. We are still non-existent in the international community. I say until yesterday, because I am now referring to the report of the Conciliation Commission — the twenty-first progress report.

I shall not speak of the inaccuracies contained in the report. As my learned brethren, the representatives of the four Arab host Governments made it quite clear, the report is pregnant with inaccuracies so substantive that they go to vitiate the veracity and the integrity of the report. I will not refer to those inaccuracies. I simply say that in the eyes of the Conciliation Commission the people of Palestine do not exist at all. We have it here in the report that the United States Government has started on an approach at a high level with the parties concerned :

«... the parties concerned - Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic». **(A/5545, p.1)**

What is the question involved in this report ? Is it the question of atomic weapons ? Is it the question of frontier disputes between these States ? Is it the question of hiding from a contractual disagreement with regard to an international agreement ? What is the problem involved between these parties: between Israel, on the one side, and the four Arab Governments, on the other. The Palestine question.

But, curiously enough, the people of Palestine are not a party. There is no mention in the report of the Conciliation Comission of the people of Palestine, whereas the Palestine question could not be without a people. It cannot be conceived of without a people. We have witnesed, during the last fifteen years, items in the General Assembly such as the Algerian question. There is an Algerian people. Items such as the Congo question; there is a Congo people. Reference has always been directly made to the people concerned. Curiously enough, surprisingly enough, the people of Palestine do not exist, In the eyes of the Conciliation Commission.

In this age of peoples, you are not, in this Organization, United States; you are united peoples. The name of this Organization is the United Nations, not United Governments, not United States; and we, as a nation, are entirely ignored by the Conciliation Commission, even as being a party concerned. Is Israel a party ? I can understand the Arab Governments being parties, either immediate, proximate parties, who come to the support of their brethren, the people of Palestine, parties who are involved because we are their kith and kin, parties who are involved because of the security of their area, whose responsibility it is to have stability and security in the region. I can understand those Arab Governments being considered as parties to the problem, but I cannot understand — and it is quite incomprehensible to me — that Israel should be considered as a party while the people of Palestine, who were at peace, who are the victims of aggression, of armed conflict, of occupation, of illegal expulsion, are considered as non-existent. No mention is made of them.

How can you solve this problem without considering its people ? You cannot solve it behind the backs of the people of Palestine. We are told in this report that the United States is approaching it on a high level. What is this «high level» ? The Committee heard Mr. Davis stating that this is not the problem of politicians; it is not a problem where the Arabs of Palestine are involved. It is the problem of the rank and file of all the people, of the masses, and high level contacts will not solve the problem except when that problem is solved to the satisfaction of the feelings, the sentiments, and the aspirations of the 80 million Arabs. He is not born, nor ever will be, who can solve this problem behind the backs of the people of Palestine, and the Arab peoples.

This is simply a travesty against the United Nations, because we are a nation. It is an international mockery — because we are part of the international community — to go behind our backs and approach Arab Governments. We are certain that the Arab Governments will defend our cause. I do not doubt for a moment that the Arab Governments will do their utmost in espousing our cause. After all, the land is ours, the country is ours, the cause is ours. We are the immediate party, and it is we who accept or reject.

I am truly amazed to see the phrase, «quiet talks», inserted in the report of the Conciliation Commission. What are these quiet talks intended for ? What are they envisaged for ? What is their objective ? We are told in the report, itself, that those talks, «quiet talks», are intended to find «the nature of the eventual solution» to the refugee problem. But, this is a comedy, in a tragedy. I cannot understand how, after fifteen years, the Conciliation Commission can speak in its report of an eventual solution to the refugee problem, of a solution in the future, of searching for a solution for another fifteen years, when the United Nations adopted a solution in 1948. Is the Commission seeking a double solution ? Is it deviating from its mandate ? Is it betraying the resolution of the General Assembly, and seeking another ? This is quite incomprehensible.

I do not think that the people of Palestine are lunatics. They can read the words and between the lines. What is the eventual solution of the refugee problem ? We know that a solution to it was put forward by the United Nations in 1948, and this position has been reaffirmed by the General Assembly. Now, the United States is seeking «the eventual solution of the problem», and speaks of no «preconditions as to the nature of the eventual solution» of the refugee problem. Mr. Plimpton told the Committee yesterday that these words in the Conciliation Commission's report does not mean preconditions as to the nature of the problem, but with regard to «methods of carrying out the Commission's mandate».

Well, to me this is a paradox, a riddle, which I cannot truly solve. This is one of the riddles which you find in crossword puzzles in newspapers in the United States. Mr. Plimpton told the Committee that it is with regard to the methods of the eventual solution, but the Conciliation Commission, in its report, speaks of the nature of the eventual solution. Well, there is a great difference between the nature of a solution and ways and means of a solution. I think that Mr. Plimpton represents the United States on the Conciliation Commission. Well, who are we to believe ?

Are we to believe Mr. Plimpton, speaking as a member of the Conciliation Commission as reproduced in the report, or are we to believe Mr. Plimpton in his statement before this Committee yesterday ? This is a paradox which I hope that the United States delegation will be able to solve sometime today, not in the future.

What are these «quiet talks»? It seems to me that when you speak of an «eventual solution of the problem» you are deviating from the solution of the United Nations for repatriation. These are not «quiet talks», but a quiet funeral, led by the Conciliation Commission, to bury what remains of the people of Palestine. This is how we understand it, the Palestine delegation, and, behind us, the people of Palestine, until this question is cleared up, amply and crystal-clear.

Well, the other aspects of the Conciliation Commission's report are amazing, too. The Conciliation Commission was established in 1948. Its members are three : the United States of America, Turkey and France. These are its three members. This is the body constituted by the United Nations with a clear mandate to facilitate the repatriation of the refugees. Now, we find that the Commission has allowed one of its members to slip out of the Commission and go and conduct «quiet talks», approach «at a high level» four of the Arab Governments.

I say that this is **ultra vires** the United Nations resolution, **ultra vires** the practice and jurisprudence of the United Nations. Here is a commission composed of three members. They must act as three, they must go as three, they must speak and think as three. It cannot be allowable, under the jurisprudence of the United Nations, for one to slip away and conduct the mandate of the United Nations Conciliation Commission. This is the duty of the Commission as a whole. It cannot delegate it to one of its members, so why should it delegate it to the United States ? Is it because the Unied States is a major Power ? Well, there are other major Powers in the world. Why not delegate it to the Soviet Union, for example ? Is it because it is a neutral Power ? The United States admittedly has never been a neutral Power in the Palestine question. It is the main cause of the creation and very survival and present existence of Israel. So, what can be the reason for delegating to one; why not to the whole Assembly ?

I respectfully submit that the Conciliation Commission has liquidated itself by this procedure. The Conciliation Commission has ceased to exist because it has functioned in this manner against the very instructions of the United Nations General Assembly. It exists no more. Unless things are corrected and brought to order — neat, tidy, open — these «quiet talks» are a synonym for secret diplomacy, which has been destroyed by the age of the United Nations. There is no room now in our world for secret diplomacy. «Quiet talks» is a gentle term, but it is very deceiving and very misleading. Things must be corrected, at least from one aspect. We are the people concerned, and the Palestine question will never be solved without the consent of the very people of Palestine. We are the people, and we are here to defend our cause.

Mr. Chairman, the item is before you, and has been before you for the last fifteen years. The crucial question cries out : What is the end of this

human tragedy ? Is there no end to the refugee problem ? Should Israel be allowed endlessly to defy the wishes of the international community and flout the United Nations resolution ? And should the United Nations sleep over this perennial problem — impotent, helpless and paralysed ? The people of Palestine are eager to know the answer. We, the Palestine delegation, on behalf of our people, put these questions before this august body. We are eager to know the answer of the United Nations to these staggering questions. We would like to know whether we should have faith in this Organization as an instrument of peace based upon justice. We would like to know whether there is a peaceful way — any peaceful way — to regain our homes and homeland. I put the question straightforwardly to all the delegations asembled here : Is there a peaceful way ? Is there any peaceful way to regain our homes and homeland ?

Lastly, we would like to know whether there is room for justice in the United Nations without the force of arms· Is there room for justice and equity and self-determination here in the United Nations without the force of arms? Law, national and international, together with your Charter and resolutions, gentlemen, dictates that we are entitled to our property, to our farms, to our orange groves, to our olive plantations, to our vineyards, and, as a whole, to our homes and our homeland. Is law sufficient in itself to restore our rights, or should we take the law in our ownhands ? Should we rise to arms ? Should we have recourse to war as the last resort ? These are the questions we earnestly and sincerely put before the Assembly.

By our nature we are not for war. We are not warmongers. We are for peace, and we come fom the land of peace, the land of the Messenger of Peace. But peace cannot be a substitute for justice, nor can it be maintained at the expense of justice. We are a people with a history; resisting aggression and repelling aggressors — that has been our history. Our record under the British mandatory regime was one of national struggle for our liberation, and thousands of our brethren have fallen martyrs on the battlefield.

Should the United Nations, and particularly those major Powers that support Israel, continue this policy of inaction, this would be an invitation to the people of Palestine to seek their rights outside the United Nations, to invoke the assistance of all freedom-loving people, and, what is more, to rise to arms. I sincerely say — and it is with a heavy heart that I say it — that this is bound to come if you do not act, gentlemen. When will it come? I cannot tell, but I can tell you it is bound to come. And when it comes the United Nations will not be able to intervene.

This tone of peace, which I put so sincerely before the General Assembly, reminds me of the appeal for peace which was put forward yesterday by the delegation of Israel. The delegation of Israel has appealed for a dialogue, and this is the term which he has used, between the Arabs on one side and Israel on the other side.

We, the people of Palestine, let me say it outright, say that our rights are not negotiable and that our right to our homeland is not negotiable, and will never be negotiable.

What is this dialogue to achieve ? Let me speak from within the framework of the United Nations, within the resolutions of the General Assembly, and within the philosophy of the United Nations. What is this dialogue intended to do ? What are the goals to be achieved by this dialogue ? Two parties take part in the dialogue. What is to be achieved with regard to the refugee problem ?

We have it on record that Israel has resisted the repatriation of the refugees, and the Conciliation Commission has reported that not a single refugee has been repatriated. What is this dialogue to achieve if there are no refugees to be repatriated ? Is this dialogue supposed to do business, or is it simply a dialogue of mockery ? If the refugees are not repatriated, what is the dialogue for ?

Let us turn to the problem of the internationalization of Jerusalem. Again I am speaking through the resolutions of the United Nations. I am not speaking my mind with regard to our national aspirations. I am speaking within the halls of the United Nations. The United Nations has decreed the internationalization of Jerusalem, and on many occasions Israel has resisted the international regime with regard to the **corpus separatum** of Jerusalem. Ben-Gurion's statement is now on record in the archives of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council. He declared : «Jerusalem shall be our eternal capital». If Jerusalem is to be the eternal capital of Israel, where is the internationalization of Jerusalem, and what is this dialogue intended to do ? If there is no internationalization, what shall we do with Jerusalem ? What is the business of this dialogue with regard to Jerusalem ?

Let us turn again to the territory — and again I am not speaking on behalf of my people, nor speaking their aspirations; I am speaking within the mansions of the United Nations. Mr. Ben-Gurion has told the Ambassador of the United States — the first Ambassador, Mr. McDonald — that «what we have gained by war we will not give up on the conference table». Well, if Mr. Ben-Gurion does not give up on the conference table what he gained on the battlefield, what is this dialogue intended to do ?

The United Nations should not be an opera house, just a dialogue with no life, no characters, and no real business to do. The dialogue of the Israeli delegation is simply intended to convert the United Nations into an opera house. If it is an opera house, it would be better for us to go to a real opera house, where we shall find a more eloquent dialogue, more amusing, more interesting, more exciting to our minds, and more leisurely for our peace. This is the dialogue of the Israeli delegation.

Well, it also invokes the spirit of Moscow — that we should abide by the spirit of Moscow. I know the spirit of Moscow and I know Moscow itself.

I was in Moscow last year, and I have followed the policy of Moscow in the United Nations for the last fifteen years. I do not know that it is in the spirit of Moscow that we should surrender our homes and homeland. This is not the spirit of Moscow. I know that it is the spirit of Moscow that you should cling to your homeland. I know that the Stalingrad battle which is the spirit of Moscow has been fought inch by inch, wall by wall, room by room, for the homeland of the Russians. This is the spirit of Moscow. It is not for us to renounce our rights, our homeland, nor to surrender our rights to repatriation. This is the spirit of Moscow.

Again, the Israeli delegation has invoked the Conference of Addis Ababa. I hail the Conference of Addis Ababa, and I hail the struggle of the people of Africa for their independence and liberty. They have called for peaceful means to solve the problem. But you know the people of Africa are supporting the people of Angola and their right to liberation in the emancipation movement which they are carrying out in Africa. The spirit of Africa is one of liberation, one of national self-determination. Negotiation is not intended that we should surrender our right. I do not know of any people represented here in this august body who would accept to negotiate their homeland, to surrender their homes, their people. A negotiation could be a peaceful and practical way for the delimitation of boundaries, to discuss conflicts or other things; but not to negotiate your very existence — your existence as a people and your homeland, as the living institution for which you live and for which you die.

The Israeli representative referred to «peace». But peace is not words ; peace is deeds. Peace is a state of mind; and this state of mind, we can easily find with regard to Israel. With regard to us, it is quite evident; it is quite obvious. We have waged war against none. We harbour aggression against none. All throughout our history, in Palestine or in the Arab world we have taken the initiative of war in no instance. We have always been on the defensive and never on the offensive. Our land has been the object and victim of aggression, but we have never committed aggression against any people. The question with regard to Israel is quite different. Israel was born in war, raised in aggression, and war is an instrument of its national policy.

In 1948, Count Bernadotte, in his progress report to the United Nations, declared :

«The Jewish State was not born in peace as was hoped for in the resolution of 29 November, but rather ... in violence and bloodshed». **(A/648, Part II, para. 5)**

So the very existence of Israel, the very birth of Israel, was in bloodshed and in war — as Count Bernadotte testified. Even our 8 January 1948, when the emergence of Israel was at stake, Mr. Ben-Gurion, in addressing the Central Committee of the Israeli Workers Party, said that force of arms and not

formal resolutions will determine the issue. So, Israel was established by force of arms and not by the resolutions of the General Assembly. That is what Mr. Ben-Gurion said. So it was born in war; it was raised in war. it is immersed in war. And again, let me remind you — though I think Dr. Bunche is not here at the moment — that in the course of the Security Council proceedings in 1948, when the Security Council was studying the question of a trusteeship, that there should be a trusteeship over Palestine instead of the establishment of two States, because it was not implemented by peace, it was Israel and the Jews themselves who warned the United Nations by war that they would fight against trusteeship, that they would fight in order to allow the emergence of Israel. So the emergence, the existence, the birth, the very existence up till today, is born in war and raised in war.

At that time, the United States put forward a plan for Palestine trusteeship, instead of the establishment of Israel. And the Israeli Command — that is the Commander-in-Chief of Israel — addressed to the United Nations. The United Nations at that time was convened at Lake Success. And this is the warning, the ultimatum, of the Israeli Command: «Our battles» — these are the first words used and employed by the Israeli Command — serve as an additional evidence for Lake Success diplomats; that is, your predecessors, gentlemen — the diplomats who were convened at Lake Success, for Lake Success diplomats who were studying the American plan, that the decisive step would be taken in Palestine in «our battles». So it was war and nothing but war which brought about Israel and its existence.

Again, if we move from 1948, from 1949 to 1950, how do we find the policy of Israel? It is a policy of war. War is the instrument for the national policy of Israel. I have it here on record — and this is from the Israeli Government Yearbook, published in October 1951. This is not a Press report; this is not a Press clipping. This is the Israeli Government Yearbook, an official statement. «Only now have we reached the beginning of independence in a part of our small country». The beginning of independence in a part of our small country. What does that mean? You are only in a part, but the country remains for you to conquer. We know of no peaceful penetration for the Israelis to take the larger part of the country they claim. There is no peaceful penetration in our age. There is an armed penetration. There is an armed occupation. And here in the Israeli Government Yearbook, they speak of the beginning of independence in part of our land. If you are now in part of your land, then you are harbouring aggression; you are harbouring extension; and you are harbouring war as an institution, as an instrument of your national policy, which is to get to all the boundaries of your country. This is the Israeli Government Yearbook. This is not a **New York Times** report. I want the Israeli delegation to come here to the rostrum of the United Nations to tell us what is the value and authority of the Israeli Government Yearbook when they say that they are now existing only in a part of their homeland.

If Israel as it stands now represents only a fraction of the homeland, I wonder where the other homeland would be, where the frontiers of Israel would be. If there are other frontiers, then it should be done only through war. And if it should be done through war, I cannot understand the gentleman from Israel in speaking yesterday of «peace» and that peace is the heart of the matter.

That was 1951. Well, it could be said that those people were arrogant at that time, were newly independent; they were very joyful about their independence so they could make every possible statement. What about 1952? Well, we read again in the Israeli Government Yearbook, in October 1952, where it says that Israel had been established «in only a portion of the land of Israel» — a portion of the land of Israel. «Some are hesitant as to the restoration of our historical frontiers fixed and set from the beginning of time. But even they will hardly deny the anomaly of the new lines» the new lines are anomalous: that the land of Israel is only in a portion of the land whose boundaries are set from immemorial time. Where is this fatherland? Where is this homeland of Israel? And now they speak and utter «peace» here in the United Nations, harbouring extension in order to get to the historic limits of their fatherland.

Well, with such a statement, it is unbelievable that the Israeli representative should come here and speak of peace. Peace is not a symphony to be conducted in an orchestra here in the United Nations. This is the national policy, as could be reproduced from official authorities of Israel. How can you answer that? Before you speak of peace, come and answer this. Come and explain the policy of Israel which speaks of frontiers — historic frontiers, which go far and wide, beyond the present lines which are described as being anomalous. Will you tell us what the lines are that are not anomalous, instead of speaking of peace?

Again, in October 1952, we have in the Israeli Government Yearbook, the following statement — I shall read only a few words: «The State of Israel has been restored in the western part ...». Well, if Israel is now in the «western part», where is the eastern part? where is the northern part, and where is the southern part? This official declaration by Israel, which is an official national policy, speaks of Israel as being established only in the western part, what does it mean? It means that there are portions of land in the east, lands in the north and lands in the south not belonging to Israel; and at any opportune moment they would be able to lift their boundaries over their shoulders and put them where the soldiers can step.

Let us go back to 1954. Again, Mr. Ben-Gurion himself says force of arms, not formal resolutions, will determine the issue. And, again, in 1955 — seven years after the emergence of Israel, when one would expect a little prudence, a little wisdom, after seven years of statehood — the following statement was made:

«The creation of the new State by no means derogates from the scope of historic Erets Israel.»

The establishment of Israel by no means derogates from the limits of historic Israel.

Finally, let me remind you of the statement by Mr. Ben-Gurion in the Knesset in 1956 and in the wake of war, in the wake of a seeming victory that the Israeli armies had been able to achieve with regard to the Sinai campaign. It was in the wake of war that Mr. Ben-Gurion spoke to the Knesset about the war against Egypt, in November 1956, in the following terms:

«One of the three objectives Israel had in the Sinai campaign was to free part of the fatherland which is still in foreign hands." This is a responsible statement, made at a responsible time, before a responsible body, speaking of the Sinai as being part of Israeli land and in foreign hands. Egypt had been the possessor and owner of the Sinai Peninsula. Now Israel comes to say that it is in the hands of strangers and this is the land of Israel; and the representative of Israel had enough courage and reason and consistency with cogency to come and speak of peace.

But leaving all these authorities aside for a moment, let me quote Mr. Ben-Gurion in response to the British Prime Minister. At that time the British Prime Minister was talking peace; he was suggesting negotiations between the Arabs and Israel; he was suggesting an approach with regard to the territorial limits between both parties. What was the response of Mr. Ben-Gurion when the British Prime Minister suggested certain changes in Israeli limits? Mr. Ben-Gurion burst into war and into a roar of war and declared — I am reading his words:

«I am convinced that Britain's Prime Minister knows very well that the boundaries of Israel could not be altered without a bloody war» — without a bloody war! — «a war of life and death.»

Well, if these limits cannot be changed except by a bloody war, a war of death, what is the meaning of the dialogue to discuss where the Israeli limits might lie? And, again, I am speaking the language of the United Nations, not our national aspiration.

But let me quote Mr. Comay himself. Mr. Comay, in November 1960, in a speech on the refugee problem, before this Committee, said:

«There is no other realistic approach short of a war which would destroy Israel and resettle the refugees amongst its ruins.»

This is the delegation which speaks of peace and speaks with regard to the solution of the refugee problem saying to the Committee in 1960 that there was nothing short of war and the destruction of Israel where the refugee problem could be settled amongst the ruins of Israel. Is this the dialogue? Is

this the peace talk? Are these the negotiations? This is the spirit which underlies the orchestra of peace which is played every once in a while by Israel. They speak of the repatriation of the refugees as possible only through war, as possible only through the destruction of Israel, as possible only through the ruins of Israel. But the repatriation of the refugees is a right and has nothing to do with war; it is an inherent right and it should be exercised.

I shall not dwell very long on this matter because the question has been dealt with in greater detail and I would simply like to refer to a statement made by a great Head of State here in the United Nations, here in the General Assembly Hall. It was the Emperor Haile Selassie. Haile Selassie was himself a refugee; Haile Selassie was thrown out of his country; Haile Selassie came to the League of Nations as a man without a country; he was ignored, he was refused, and his right was not recognized. At this session, the United Nations heard the Emperor refugee, but as a sovereign ruler of his country. But after what? After a heavy toll of bloodshed and human misery.

Referring to his statement before the League of Nations, the Emperor spoke at this session from the rostrum of the General Assembly — and Haile Selassie's country was the seat of a recent African conference, the conference which was invoked by the Israeli delegation. The Emperor said the following:

> «I spoke then both to and for the conscience of the world. My words went unheeded, but history testifies to the accuracy of the warning that I gave in 1936.» **(A/PV. 1229, page 2)**

These solemn words should be an inspiring lesson to the United Nations to redress our refugees not in bloodshed, not in human misery, but in peace and in justice.

Summing up, let it be known that our case boils down to a set of clear-cut fundamentals, absolute fundamentals:

First, the problem of the Palestine refugees is an indivisible part of the Palestine problem, and its solution can be sought only within the general pattern of the Palestine question, on the basis of the right of the indigenous people of Palestine to self-determination.

Secondly, the Palestine problem was the outcome **ab initio** of a conspiracy between Zionism and the forces of international imperialism. As a colonial issue, the Palestine problem can be solved only in accordance with the general framework of decolonization, as established in this last era of the United Nations.

Thirdly, the exile of the Palestine refugee was the direct outcome, with a relation of cause and effect, of the establishment of Israel. In order to settle an alien people on the land, the native people of Palestine were robbed of their homes and uprooted from their homeland.

Fourthly, the people of Palestine, being the legitimate owners of the country, are determined to exercise — and to the full — all their rights, national and private.

They are determined, with unshakeable resourcefulness, to regain their lands, their fields, their towns, their villages, and what is more, to regain their homeland — the patrimony of their ancestors since time immemorial. To this end, we shall struggle relentlessly and we shall not stand alone. The Arab peoples, our kith and kin, will extend every support, for this is in essence an Arab cause. Furthermore, all men and women of honour and dignity will come to our support, for this is a cause of man's honour and man's dignity. And last but not least, all freedom and peace-loving peoples will sponsor our cause by all means, — and I say by all means, loudly and without hesitation — for this is a cause of peace and a cause of freedom.

The question that faces the United Nations now, therefore, is concise and to the point. What is the position of the United Nations? This is the fateful and decisive question that lies before you. It lies with you to answer the question and we urge you to answer the question.

It lies with you to answer the question, the crucial question — peace or no peace, war or no war — and the choice rests with you. I appeal to you to cast your choice in favour of peace and in favour of peace only, based upon justice and nothing but justice. This is our profound hope and it is our fervent prayer.

SECOND STATEMENT

Made before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly at its 407th meeting, held on 14 November 1963, at 10 : 30 a. m.

(Source : U. N. Document A/SPC/PV. 407) .

We owe it to the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, Mr. Davis, along with other factors, that the cause of the Palestine refugees is still kept alive in the United Nations. Mr. Davis and his predecessors have always given a true and vivid picture of the distressing conditions of the refugees, their misery and their human affliction. Israel, on the other hand, has made every effort to suppress the facts, to belittle the picture, and, on the whole, to becloud the issue. The forces of Zionism, with their grip so tight on the media of information in most of the Western countries, have succeeded in a large measure to keep the problem of the refugees away from public opinion, and, in a way, to squeeze them out of human memory.

The Arab refugees have no electoral colleges in the outside world; nor have they any means of approaching congressmen, senators and the framers of public opinion. During election years, here in the United States, it has always been our deep concern that the problem of the refugees has been drowned in election campaigning. In fact, the problem of Palestine as a whole, and the problem of the refugees in particular, has suffered for so long what I would call — to coin a phrase — «election fallout» in the United States.

The General Assembly is well aware of the hazards of atomic radiation and the ill-effects of radio-active fallout in this world of ours. Although so far scientists have not indicated any serious damage to the public health of mankind due to radio-active fallout, «election fallout», as I coin it, has done a great deal of damage to a whole people. It is because of this «election fallout» in the United States that a whole people has become a refugee nation. Elections in the United States, I submit, should be no part or parcel whatsoever of the Palestine problem, or even the refugee problem.

I know of no other problem that has figured so prominently in the election campaigns of the United States. I have not heard it said in the elec-

tion campaigns that the Congo problem should be solved this way or that way either by Republicans or by Democrats. I should like to ask here in this Committee, so that the people of the United States can hear ; why is it that the Palestine problem should be part and parcel of the election campaign ? Why is it that the refugee problem should prominently figure as part and parcel of the election campaign in the United States ?

It is true that the Arabs in the United States have no electoral colleges ; it is common knowledge that there are Americans here of Arab descent, Americans of Syrian descent, Americans of Lebanese descent and, I would say, Americans of Palestinian descent. But these Arabs have never identified themselves as such.

They did not form pressure groups and they have not asked that the policy of the United States should be shaped in one way or the other. This «election fallout» is more dangerous, I submit, Mr. Chairman, than the radioactive fallout to this world of ours. The people of Palestine should be protected against it, they should be guarded against it.

It is true that President Truman, when, in 1947, he was dealing with the question of Palestine and in response to the protestations of the United States diplomats in the Middle East told them that we have no Arab constituencies, we have no Arab voters. But the Jewish vote should in no way be a determining factor with regard to the policies of the United States, as far as the Palestine problem and the refugee's problem is concerned.

The Palestine question should only be decided on its merits, and its merits only. This is a deplorable and regrettable situation· For the question of the refugees should be judged on its own merits. I know it has always been a source of grief for us, the refugees, for us, the people of Palestine, to hear from time to time statements of policy made in Western circles without paying due regard to the rights of the refugees. Sometimes this is done in ignorance, sometimes it is done in innocence and so many times it is done as a Zionist connivance.

It becomes, therefore, necessary that the United Nations, through all media of information under its command — and I am addressing myself now to the Secretariat, so ably represented by Dr. Bunche, who is now seated here in the Committee — addressing myself to the Secretariat, that it is their duty to inform world public opinion of the whole problem of the Palestine refugees. This is a human drama involving a whole people and mankind is entitled to know and to know the truth. We recall when the Jewish refugees were in their camps in Europe the whole world was on a volcano, and all human resources were mobilized to state their case and to alleviate their plight. This is quite understandable, and understandable by us, the refugees, the people of Palestine. But we are entitled to ask here in this Committee and to put this

question to this august body, why this silence with regard to the Palestine refugees ? Why this silence with regard to our plight, the distressing conditions of our people, living in tents and camps for the last fifteen years. Why this indifference ?

Human brotherhood is one, it should be one. Human brotherhood is indivisible, and it should be indivisible. It is only fair that the United Nations should make every effort not to dramatize the matter, for the drama is there, but to expose the misery of thousands upon thousands of our countrymen, of our people living in exile for the last fifteen years. We ask the United Nations to propagate the truth and nothing but the truth, about the problem. We do not want propaganda, but we want the truth to be told to the world, we want our cause to be exposed to the whole world, to the whole of mankind, for this is how best we can serve the cause of peace because peace can only be served, and best served, by the dissemination of truth and by the propagation of truth. It was the great reformer Erasmus who once said : «Bring the light in and the darkness will be put out». The refugees have been living in the darkness for so long — Mr. Chairman and honourable delegates — let us be fair when we speak, let us be just when we act.

If, at least, we cannot speak the truth here in this Committee, let us not speak distortion, and let us not speak falsehood. Let us not speak falsehood, I say, under any slogan, for there are many slogans here in the United Nations to speak distortion. One of those slogans is the freedom of speech, the other slogan is realism and that we should think in realistic terms and that we should be guided by the actualities of the situation, by the realities of the situation. These are the slogans that we have heard here in the United Nations as the Palestine delegation.

But let me submit that freedom of speech is not synonymous with distortion or with wilful misrepresentation; neither is to be guided by realism and the realities of the situation synonymous with justice. If a situation is not just, is not equitable, it should not be a guide to the United Nations as an everlasting reality upon which the United Nations should act. The United Nations should act only upon just realities, equitable realities, not upon realities in the abstract. This United Nations is faced with aggressions in various forms and quarters of the world. If you take aggression as a reality, you would abide by aggression and the United Nations would bow to aggression. The reality should be based on justice and equity; otherwise, it should not be everlasting. It must be erased and it should not be a guiding factor in the United Nations, because then the United Nations would simply abide by aggression, under the slogan of the «realities of the situation». If you are to be guided by the realities of a situation, you must stand ready to accept aggressions, encroachments and violations of human rights.

You have been seized here in the United Nations with various complaints regarding violations of human rights. Discrimination in South Africa is a reality. Are you disposed to accept that reality, because it exists in South Africa, and because it is legislated by a sovereign State represented here in the United Nations ? It is only just realities and equitable situations that must survive and must prevail in your minds, your hearts and your consciences. Otherwise, I should like to associate myelf with the phrase used by our colleague from New Zealand, yesterday, that « we might as well pack up and go home ». **(A/SPC/PV.406, p.43-45).** Indeed, Mr. Chairman, you should pack up and go home, if you just accept the realities of the situation regardless of the facts, whether they are based on justice or injustice, whether they are based on equity or inequity.

Ever since the problem of the refugees came into being Israel has been diverting public attention from the tragedy. To achieve such a goal, Israel has spared no effort. Israel went so far as to employ means bordering on scandal. And very likely this applies equally to other countries where Zionism is operating in full strength. When I use the word «scandal», I mean it in all its connotations, pregnant in every aspect and with every meaning of the word. As we revealed, as a result of an inquiry held here in the United States in August 1963 — and I invite the attention of our distinguished colleague from the United States to this drama, this scandalous drama which has been revealed by an inquiry held here in the United States in August 1963 by the United States Committee on Foreign Relations, under the chairmanship of Senator Fulbright — a number of American organizations are being financed by Israel, with the deliberate purpose of misleading American public opinion. The report of the Committee, which has just been published, has disclosed outstanding facts showing how Israel is employing various American institutions — and I invite the attention of the people of the United States to this scandal — through the payment of grants and remunerations by Israel and Israeli agents damage the Arab cause, and particularly the problem of the refugees.

It is not my business to speak on other matters on which Israel is poisoning the mind of the public in the United States, but I am simply concerned with the cause of the Arab refugees and to see how far Israel and Israeli agents are employing American organizations, with American names — big names — in order to poison public opinion, to mislead public opinion in the United States, and make it so offensive and so detrimental to the interests of the Arab refugees.

I will only cite a few illustrations. These illustrations are taken from the report of Senator Fulbright — from his Committee. These illustrations were published in the report. Let me quote this illustration, the very first one.

The American Zionist Council received annually — and this American Zionist Council is an American body — by its members, by its constitution and by its function it is an American organization — received annually from Israel $328,350. These are not tens of dollars or hundreds of dollars but $328,000 received from Israel. To do what? I shall not place before you my inferences or my conclusions: I will simply quote the report of Senator Fulbright. To do what? «To combat Arab propaganda... by means of radio, television, films, periodicals, speakers' bureaus, subsidized trips to Israel .. etc.» It is further interesting to note that the same council received in one year $712,000 from Israel. Some of these funds were devoted, according to the report of Senator Fulbright, «to the distribution of special material and guidance on controversial issues such as Arab refugees..» Seven hundred thousand dollars, three quarters of a million dollars paid by Israel to American institutions here in the United States to combat controversial issues, namely the Arab refugees' question.

Our ditinguished colleague of the United States here comes to speak of fairness and equity with regard to the solution of the refugee problem when the people are misled here in the United States. Again quoting from the report, that money is being paid to these American institutions for «subsidization to individual public opinion molders» — public opinion molders, public opinion makers — «to help provide them with an experience in Israel», and to capitalize — and this is very important — on «how to draft pro-Israeli proclamations for governors and mayors». Three quarters of a million dollars to be paid in order that mayors and governors in the United States are helped to have their proclamations doctored. I hope the statement of the United States here is also not drafted by those makers and molders of public opinion, with the strength of three quarters of a million dollars. I hope it is simply made by the United States itself without being influenced by the efforts of these American organizations subsidized by Israeli agents.

As a second illustration, it was reported that a Washington news-letter entitled Near East Report was receiving $5,000 quarterly for «public relations».

As a third illustration, it was reported that an annual subsidy of $48,000 was paid by Israeli agents to «The Council on Middle Eastern Affairs».

A fourth illustration, «The American Christian Palestine Committee» — and see how this title is so misleading and so subversive — «The Christian Palestine Committee» to be subsidized by Israel — and it had secured for a long period of time substantial aid from Israel.

Furthermore, in its hearing on the first of August 1963, the Senate Committee took note of an annual contribution of $7,000 made to Harvard Uni-

versity — here is a distinguished university in the United States receiving $7,000 — through its Center for Middle East Studies. These United States institutions with their big titles and big names are shaping public opinion on behalf of Israel; and I would not mind it that Israel should be dictating its will on the policies of the United States except that they should not touch upon the problem of the refugees and the right of the people of Palestine to their homes and to their homeland. The United States can accept being subordinated by Israel, but not to the extent of damaging our cause, not to the extent of being detrimental to our rights, the rights of our people. This is most devastating to the cause of the Palestine refugees. It is only fair that such a Zionist «conduit» — and I put «conduit» in quotes as described by Senator Fulbright — should be outlawed, not only in the United States, but in all countries where Zionism is functioning.

We, the refugees of Palestine, the people of Palestine, who cannot approach the Congress, or the Senate, or the White House, we who do not possess these huge amounts to subsidize American organizations in the United States, these refugees who are living on six cents a day, are unable to approach United States public opinion. It is for this reason that we urge you in the Committee, as representing your countries and States, that necessary measures on this matter be taken to outlaw such campaigns, such distortion and avalanche of misrepresentation, highly financed and highly organized, to mislead the people and to poison their minds. If such an action is taken, you can be sure that Israel will not be able to draft for governors in the United States, nor for anyone in the United States nor for senators, nor even for cabinet ministers in the United States proclamations antagonistic to the Arab cause, to the problem of the refugees.

The Committee can also be sure that Israel will not be able to reverse a decision of the United States Government, and I say that Israel has been able to reverse a decision of the United States Government on several occasions because of this «conduit» as described by Senator Fulbright in his report. I say that, not as an expression of opinion or as an inference, but as a fact. Long before the United States inquiry, Ben-Gurion revealed this fact in a statement to **The New York Times,** dated 5 November 1951, and I call the attention of the delegate of the United States to this highly important and highly insidious statement by Mr. Ben-Gurion. He declared as follows:

> «In the United States, contact could be made with the legislators and the press. This situation enabled the Government of Israel on several occasions to influence the United States Government and to reverse its earlier decisions».

Whether it is boasting or otherwise, it is an admission by Mr. Ben-Gurion, declaring to the world and through **The New York Times** that the Israeli

Government was able to reverse decisions of the United States. I have great sympathy for the great nuclear power of the United States to have its decisions reversed by Mr. Ben-Gurion, through the subsidization of American institutions and approaches of «conduit» to Senators and mayors and cabinet ministers. It has our very great sympathy, the sympathy of refugees who are looking for the sympathy of the international world.

I would like to ask; under the present circumstances, are the refugees able to reverse the decisions of the United States? Are we in a position to press the United States Government to impress its decisions? I would like an answer from the United States representative to this question. Here we have Mr. Ben-Gurion claiming, and rightly so, that he was able to reverse the decisions of the United States. Let me put the question point blank to the United States delegation and to the United States Government: Do they stand ready and prepared — not by money, not by «conduit», but by the force of logic, by the force of reason, by the force of justice and equity — are they prepared to reverse their decisions in favour of justice and in favour of equity?

In the minimum of justice, we should uphold the cause of the refugees and explain their misery. Dr. Davis tells us of the depressing conditions in which they live; the figures which make up the budget are very trembling indeed, and present a trembling picture. They show that a refugee survives on six cents a day, which covers shelter, relief, medical care and education. I am not making an issue of this meagre allocation: the Palestine refugees are primarily a United Nations responsibility; their problem was created at the doorstep of this Organization and as a direct result of the 1947 Partition Plan passed by the United Nations. It is still within memory and we live that memory that the General Assembly was literally warned that an armed conflict was bound to follow, and that consequently a refugee problem had to take place. Even those who voted for partition did so with a heavy heart, and many of them are here present in this Organization, represented here round this table.

Speaking on the plan for the creation of Israel, the representative of Sweden — and I remind him of his eloquent words — said: «The plan has its weak sides and some dangerous omissions.» The dangerous omissions, to which the representative of Sweden has referred, have given birth to the refugee problem.

The representative of Canada — and I call the attention of the representative of Canada to the words of Canada — said: «We support the plan with heavy heart and many misgivings.» Certainly with heavy heart, because the problem of the refugees was in store; it was imbedded in the resolution

of 1947; it was part and parcel of the Partition Plan. And the misgivings you have seen in the one and one quarter million refugees, whom we now represent here before this august body.

The representative of New Zealand — and I remind our colleague of New Zealand who spoke yesterday in the Committee about the problem, I shall make reference to his statement in my concluding statement at a later stage, but let me now remind him of the statement of New Zealand when the Partition Plan was in the proceedings of the General Assembly — spoke of the «grave inadequacies of the present proposal.» And these grave inadequacies can only be translated by the existence of one and one quarter million refugees now living in exile for the last fifteen years.

The Foreign Minister of Belgium, who was so eloquent and so pressing in his statement, spoke to the Assembly in these historic words, these prophetic words: «We are not certain that (the plan) is completely just, we doubt whether it is practical and we are afraid that it involves great risks.» There was a prophet; the Foreign Minister of Belgium is speaking of the great risks, and we are here, in miniature, that great risk of the Partition Plan.

Then he continues:

> «... The Palestine question is particularly disturbing for the Belgians. They have to make an effort to understand Zionism. The national home of our Jewish patriots is in Belgium. No one has treated them in such a manner as to make them want to find another home in Palestine.»

But the most intsructive statement made at the time was made by the delegation of the United States. The position of the United States at that time — I submit with all due respect — was so naive and so subversive and so destructive that it remains, up to the present moment, ununderstandable and unthinkable. These are the words of the representative of the United States in support of the partition plan and in support of the creation of Israel, and these are his historic words, which are devoid of truth and any content, of any international decent content. Now I read them so that you know I am not making any brutal attack against the United States. It is because the question is so brutal that we emlpoy brutal terms and brutal terminology. We are not brutal by nature, but the problem now before you — living now before you as a current item for fifteen years — makes our brutal expressions come to the United Nations. These are the words of the representative of the United States:

> «The boundary between the Jewish and Arab States will be as friendly as the bounday which runs for 3,000 miles between Canada and the United States.»

What a blasphemy and blasphemous statement made by the United States to prophesy that the lines between Israel and the Arab States would be as friendly as the 3,000 miles that separate Canada. I think that Canada should protest this plasphemy. And every decent man in the world should protest this blasphemy. There are more than a thousand human beings killed around the boundaries between Israel — I would say the demarcation lines — between Israel and the Arab States. What a naive statement to make in 1947. They come only after fifteen years to say «Well, it seems to be unworkable. It seems to be contradictory. It seems to be irreconcilable.»

As the representative of the United Kingdom has said, the United Kingdom has found after twenty-five years that the mandate over Palestine was irreconcilable. It took them twenty-five years to know it. And a kindergarten man — a kindergarten infant, excuse me, I am speaking to men, that is why I referred to kindergarten men — it is only a kindergarten infant who can see that those things are irreconsilable and unworkable, if you only consult your conscience and consult your proper thinking and equity and justice.

I can see that my colleague of the United States is amazed at this statement, and it really is amazing. He does not know the history of the problem. In the same manner as the other day, when he was speaking on the question of procedure, he was looking around for the veterans around him to guide him with the rules of procedure. My distinguished friend, you go back to the records and see this statement of the United States Government, stating this naive policy of the United States, creating a State with boundaries supposedly to be as friendly as the Canadian-American boundary. This is the assumption upon which the whole drama has been built. This is the foundation of Israel, which was created and which was born in the White House.

Such was the apprehension of those who voted for the partition and the creation of Israel. Those who opposed it were almost prophets, whose prophesy was the present tragedy as it stands, with nothing less and everything more.

It is with this disastrous background in mind that Count Bernadotte has spoken of the continuing United Nations responsibility in the matter of the Palestine refugees.

In his progress report to the United Nations, Count Bernadotte — and, again, I do not see Dr. Bunche here to remind him of these historic and fateful occasions; I saw him yesterday only when the question of procedure was before the Committee, but not on this question of substance — said:

> «... As residents of Palestine, a former mandated territory for which the international community has a continuing responsibility until a final set-

tlement is achieved, these Arab refugees understandably look to the United Nations for effective assistance.» **(A/648, part three, chapter VI, para. 1 (d))**

When Count Bernadotte spoke of United Nations «continuing responsibility» and «effective assistance», he did not mean the appropriation of six cents a day; neither are we here to complain about six cents a day. We are here to state our case, not to make any complaints with regard to this meager allocation. This is a slender measure of relief, barely sufficient to keep the refugees alive.

Count Bernadotte spoke of other means, more in keeping with the human worth and the dignity of man. In his report, he went further and stated:

> «The liability of — Israel to restore private property to its Arab owners and to indemnify those owners for property wantonly destroyed is clear...» **(A/648, part one, chapter V, para. 7)**

Since that verdict was given by Count Bernadotte, Arab property has not been restored to its owners, nor has indemnity been paid for property wantonly destroyed. The balance-sheet of the refugees is now up to date. Count Bernadotte's recommendations have not been carried out, because of Israel's defiance and because of Israel's arrogance. All those recommendations have been buried with him in his eternal rest.

Fifteen years have passed and the refugees are still living on charity; fifteen years have passed and the international community is paying the price of Israel's defiance. You are paying the cost of Israel's defiance, and nothing more. Israel has seized the property of the refugees, as well as the revenues of the property, and the United Nations Agency, under the leadership of Mr. Davis, is always imploring the world community to make their contributions. Thus charity is extended to a people which own property. These people are not landless, they are not penniless; they do own property, colossal property, and what enormous property! The question is really great; and the answer is really staggering. It discloses outrageous international robbery.

Figures and statistics are often very cold; they bespeak no passion and no emotion. But in the case of Arab property, figures breathe emotions of anger, resentment and bitterness. I shall not submit any evidence on the matter although the evidence is overwhelming. The plain admission of Israel is sufficient, and nothing is more incriminating than an admission.

On page 17 of the report of the Palestine Commission, a report submitted to the United Nations, we read the following from a statement of Mr. Ben-Gurion with reference to Arab and Jewish property in Palestine. «The Arabs own 94 per cent of the land, the Jews only 6 per cent.» Brief as it is, this

confession by Mr. Ben-Gurion serves to measure the dimensions of the tragic plight of the refugees. This statement shows that today Israel owns only 6 per cent of Isarel. Just imagine, this paradox that combines a comedy with a tragedy. What kind of State would the United States be if 94 per cent of the land of the United States was owned by the people of Canada ? And I make this comparison to please our distinguished colleague of the United States, because he is always happy to make analogies and comparisons between the United States and Canada. What would the United States be if 94 per cent of the land here in this sub-continent of the United States were owned by Canada and 6 per cent were owned by the people of the United States ?

This is the situation with regard to Israel; it simply owns 6 per cent of the land, the rest of the land is ours. This is no state, and this is statehood. It is because of this, **inter alia** : this is one of the reasons that we do not recognize Israel, we will never recognize Israel. And, by the way, when I mention the word Israel, it is only for the convenience of the honourable delegates of the United Nations; it does not imply any recognition on our part. This is no state, as I said. This is an act of usurpation which could only take place as the fruition of an invasion, accomplished by a military occupation. And this is the situation with Israel, established not on its own, but on the land of the refugees, we the people — we are representing our people who own the land now held under Israel by military occupation and by invasion, an unlawful and illegitimate existence.

Israel is there on our land, on our property. The Israelis occupy our homes, they occupy our farms. They farm our land, our vineyards, our orange groves. And they come here to say that we are individuals here. We are simply nothing here, we represent nobody, and Mr. Shukairy does not even represent Mr. Shukairy. That is the gist of the fallacy of the Israeli, Mr. Comay, who was speaking yesterday about granting me, or not granting me, a status before the United Nations.

We have not come here to be recognized or to have a status recognized for us. We draw our strength from our people, the people of Palestine, we draw our strength from the Arab people, and we draw sympathy from all freedom-loving people and peace-loving people all over the world.

The distinguished delegates from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union, yesterday, out of courtesy, accorded me this title of Chairman of the Palestine delegation. We are not asking the United Nations to accord this title to me, or that title. We are here to state our cause and we do not draw our pretensions from the United Nations. Our freedom shall exist in the trees which our forefathers have planted in our homeland, in our churches, in our mosques, in our plantations, in our villages, in our homes. Every atom of the soil of the Holy Land is our credential and it is on the strength of this credential that we are here before the United

Nations asking not mercy, but asking right and justice. We are not asking your equity. We are simply asking justice and our inherent, inalienable right to our homes and to our land, and to our homeland.

We are not individuals here, Mr. Chairman. The truth is that if anyone in connexion with Palestine is an individual, it is Mr. Comay who is an individual, but in the context of Palestine, Mr. Comay is not a Palestinian. All of us, we twenty people here, are Palestinians since time immemorial. Our fathers and forefathers have been buried in our land. We have toiled and sweated for our farms and for our plantations. We robbed nobody, everything is ours, our possession. Wherever it is the Israelis are in the land, an individual has robbed us of our property, of our homes. The homes in which they reside are ours. The farms they farm are ours, the plantations they control are our possession. The beds they sleep in are our beds, with our blankets. Even the spoons with which they eat, the cups out of which they drink, are ours, too. This is not figurative, this is actual.

I want you, if you have a visiting mission, to go to Israel to find out for yourself that everything in Israel is Arab property, is Arab possessions, is Arab ownership. We are not individuals.

I said that Mr. Comay — and I say — that he is not a Palestinian. He comes from South Africa. I am not making personal remarks, but he is a living testimony here before the United Nations, he is a living witness. As we say in English law, primary evidence is preferable to secondary evidence, and Mr. Comay is primary evidence before the United Nations to show that he is not a Palestinian, he comes from South Africa. He owns nothing in Palestine, we own, he possesses nothing in Palestine, we possess.

Even Mrs. Golda Meir is a United States citizen. She has always been a United States citizen, and I know of no persecution here in the United States against the Jews. In fact, they have a privileged title, this is to be admitted. But how on earth can a United States citizen become, overnight, a citizen of Israel, simply by setting foot on the soil of Palestine and become a Foreign Minister; and we are «individuals», we are «absentees», we exist not, we represent nobody. This is the lunatic fallacy which is submitted to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, stated in detail, Arab property is not a tract of land located here or there, or a number of holdings scattered in one place or another.

The Arab refugees now living in camps own, wholesale, towns and villages. United Nations records show that Arab ownership in Palestine consists of twenty towns and 841 villages in their totality. The fields, the orange groves, and the olive plantations (and most of the dollar earnings of Israel) are Arab property and Arab wealth. The Jaffa oranges which you find in all world markets are our property. They were planted by our toil and sweat. Arab na-

tional income is seized by Israel to finance the settlement of new immigrants, Jewish immigrants. Suffice it to know that the refugees office under the Conciliation Commission has established that the lands abandoned by the Arab refugees are 16,324 square kilometres. (This estimate excluded the demilitarized zones and the Jerusalem no-man's land and the communal Arab lands.) The nineteenth progress report of the Palestine Conciliation Commission, submitted to the United Nations in October 1961, estimated the separate land holdings individually owned by the Arab refugees as totalling 450,000 holdings. All such estimates have not included other types of Arab property. As to the country's products, the Arabs produced 80 per cent of the total cereal crops, 98 per cent of the olive and 70 per cent of the citrus.

Even stone products now exported by Israel are supplied by fifty-two Arab quarries — let alone the hundreds of Arab quarries used for local construction.

Thus it is not only our tender grapes, not only our tender oranges or tender olives which are being seized by Israel. Our very hardstone property is not being spared; it is being robbed and seized and produced for the markets of the world by Israel. And with what bravery Mr. Comay comes here and claims that we are nothing. Well, give us our lands and our property, our stone quarries, and then we will settle accounts as to whether we are nothing, or whether you are nothing.

I place these details before you not to sell out our country but to enlighten the Committee about the gigantic ownership of the Arabs, so that it will understand the import of the pertinent paragraph in the Afghanistan draft resolution (A/SPC/L.99) — co-sponsored by others — with regard to the properties of the Arab refugees. If you want to know the import of that paragraph, you should ponder the gigantic, colossal proportions and dimensions of Arab property in Palestine. We will not sell out our country; we will not give up our homeland for all the treasures of the world. I cited these facts simply to tell you that the refugees who live on 6 cents a day each have left behind properties worth billions and billions of dollars — all seized by Israel. Israel has seized our land in the region and is now seizing our seat here in the United Nations, because — as has been pointed out by the representative of Iraq in his statement the other day — if the Mandate had been duly applied, you would now have before you a State of Palestine, occupying its seat next to a worthy delegation, Pakistan, according to the alphabetical order. And it will come about, some day; we are sure it will come about.

But to gain a clearer picture about the property of the refugees, let me make a brief contrast with Jewish property, Jewish property in Palestine, for a contrast is more telling and more instructive, and more infomative. I do not give you our figures, or our statistics or press reports or newspaper clippings.

These are the figures of the United Nations Committee on Palestine. This Committee, in its report to the United Nations, has set out a table showing the percentage of Jewish ownership in Palestine, by sub-districts. I shall not weary the Committee by reading the whole table; a few items are illustrative. In Acre, for instance — and, by the way, this is a historic coincidence; it is my home, town, and maybe other districts, also, are the domiciles and residences of some of my colleagues on my left, here, other districts may be the residences of them and their forefathers. In Acre, Jewish ownership is only 3 per cent. The Jews own 3 per cent in my home town, and Mr. Shukairy is simply «an individual» here, because I own 97 per cent of the rest of the land. You see, now, the analogy, the philosophy, and the logic which lacks logic — the philosophy and the analogy — of the Israeli argument ? In Jenin, for instance — and one of my colleagues on the delegation comes from Jenin — the Jews own 1 per cent. And my colleague on the delegation, he is an «individual», because the Jews own 1 per cent and because he owns 99 per cent. Therefore he is « Mr. Nobody », and Mr. Comay, he is «Mr. Everybody».

In Nablus, they own 0 per cent. In Tulkarm — and one of my colleagues also comes from Tulkarm — the Jews own 17 per cent and the rest, 82 per cent, is owned by my colleague, in his sub-district. My colleague comes from Jordan; he is a Palestinian, he is «Mr. Nobody». And Mrs. Golda Meir is «Everybody» because she simply owns a fraction of the sub-district. Again, in Beersheba, the Jews own 1 per cent — and here again is one of my colleagues, a refugee, who is nobody because he owns 99 per cent, and the Jews own 1 per cent.

This is the tragic situation in which we find ourselves. We are not accredited any status here in the United Nations; we do not exist at all. Our properties exist, the land is there, our homes are there, but we do not exist. The immovables exist but human beings do not exist. They are nothing.

In the Negeb District — and once again one of our colleagues is a refugee from the Negeb — the Jews own, and this is fantastic, 1/2 of 1 per cent. It is not 1 per cent; it is half of the 1 per cent — and I should tell you that the Negeb Sub-District constitutes almost half the area of Palestine. In half of the area of Palestine the Jews own half of 1 per cent, and the rest is Arab public ownership, and still the Arabs are not to be considered as existing at all; they have no rights at all. Everything belongs to Israel, even by means of robbery. Robbery has become a code in international law whereby one can possess and one can own. That is the situation in which we find ourselves. This fragmentary, fractional and insignificant Jewish property in Palestine is a clear demonstration of the preponderance of Arab property.

As to income — let me now speak about the income, as I have spoken about the property — it is enough to know that the annual income of Arab property amounts to £.47 million sterling; £.47 million sterling, yearly, is the

Arab income. The grand total for the last fifteen years speaks for itself; I will not make the calculation, I will not give you the grand total. It is enough for you to multiply £.47 million sterling by fifteen, and you will get the grand total demonstrating the grandest international robbery ever recorded in human history.

Yet it may be asked : how is Israel disposing of this large income of the refugees ? How are our incomes and revenues being disposed of by Israel ? How are the £.47 million sterling being disposed of by Israel, and how does Israel account for the revenue ? Here again, I shall not produce Press clippings or unofficial reports. I shall produce Israel itself and Israeli missions and the Israeli official report. I refer to page 43 of the official digest of the Jewish Agency of 25 May 1951. This can be found in the library of the United Nations, if anyone wishes to consult it — the Digest of the Jewish Agency. Look up page 43, and you will find the following : 40 per cent of the revenues goes for repair. I am not quarrelling with this forgery «repair», which is supposed to be 40 per cent; I will not quarrel with that forgery. And then, 25 per cent is for taxes. Neither will I quarrel with this 25 per cent taxes. Then 13 per cent goes for administration expenses. Neither will I quarrel with this item. And then, 12 per cent for development. What remains, after calculation, is only 10 per cent of our revenues, of our income. I shall leave these forgeries aside ; I shall leave the misappropriations aside, but let me stick to this slender figure — 10 per cent.

Even this 10 per cent is not paid to us. It is not paid to the refugees. One would expect Israel to pay the net revenues to the refugees either through the Conciliation Commission or through Dr. Davis for the refugees who are living on 6 cents a day in misery, in distress, in torture and affliction. This 10 per cent even after discounting all those forged itemizations, is not paid to Dr. Davis to be refunded to the refugees or to the Conciliation Commission. It is paid by Israel to Israel. They are handed by Israel over to Israel. The net revenue, even after all these misappropriations, is earmarked to settle Jewish immigrants. The 10 per cent is employed to settle Jewish immigrants, not to be refunded to the Arab refugees so that they can survive and survive on their own properties, and in order to overburden the commitments of the United Nations here with regard to the financial assistance extended to the United Nations Agency.

While the refugees are hardly keeping soul and body together with 6 cents a day, the 10 per cent or whatever remains of our income is being applied by Israel in order to settle Jewish immigrants. Just imagine, Jewish immigrants are settled on Arab land, settled on our land and by Arab capital, by our revenue. This is the capital offence which is in the first degree.

Thus, Israel has not only usurped the property of the refugees but deprived them of their revenues. By depriving them of their revenues, it deprived them of their inherent right to live, their inherent right to survive as human beings.

You can deprive a human being of the right of liberty or democracy, or even the right of worship, but how on earth can you deprive him of his very right to live as a man in this world, in this globe of ours, to be denied the right to live and strictly to be left to live on charity? Most degrading as it is and most honurable as it is for the contributing Governments, these people have enormous property and enormous income. This is the import and significance of the draft resolution that stands before the house now in the name of Afghanistan and other delegations which co-sponsored that resolution.

When a whole people are expelled from their homeland, when they are robbed of their property, when their income is seized, when they are left on the verge of starvation, this is nothing but genocide, committed within the sight of the United Nations and within the hearing of the civilized world.

This is not fiery oratory. Our colleague of the United States in his statement the other day said that fiery oratory will not serve the interests of the refugees. I am not an orator, nor a fiery orator. But behind us there is a fiery situation. It is not a stigma to have a fiery oratory, but the stigma lies with those Powers which created a situation which leads to a fiery situation and leads to a fiery oratory. What, after all, is behind fiery oratory ? Behind it is the plight and affliction of a whole people, of a refugee nation living in exile for the last fifteen years. If there is any disgrace in this world, it is not the disgrace of a fiery oratory or employing of fiery oratory, but creating of a fiery situation which leads to a fiery oratory. We will betray our cause, Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates of the United States, if we come here without a fiery oratory.

What is behind a funeral march when you hear it ? You would not protest certainly, our distinguished colleague of the United States ? Because behind the funeral march there is a funeral. And behind the fiery oratory here which you might feel, whether in the statements of the Arab delegations or in the statements of the Palestine delegation, there is the most fiery situation, the greatest injustice ever committed in the whole world. It is no stigma to have a fiery oratory. I need not remind our distinguished colleague that fiery oratory is one of the treasures of our civilization; it is one of the treasures of our culture. What is the American revolution without the treasures of the fiery oratory of the great orators of the United States during its revolution ? The fiery oratory of the United States was a fiery expression against the colonialism of the United Kingdom and the imperialism of the United Kingdom. It was that fiery situation of the imperialism of the United Kingdom that led to the fiery oratory of the American revolution and led eventually to the American revolution which is one of the greatest possessions of the world.

And what is the French revolution without Mirabeau and without the National Assembly, without the fiery orators of France who are the great possession and asset of this world ? It would be devoid of its content, it would be

devoid of its very existence. Those two revolutions would not have existed without the fiery orators.

If you are to blame, you have to blame the fiery situation, the fiery causes that have led to the fiery oratories. After all, what is the Charter which you invoke every once in a while. I hear the distinguished representatives every once in a while invoking certain Charter provisions. What is the Charter of the United Nations, except that it is a fiery instrument of the civilized world. What are the contents of your Charter ? «Independence», which is contained in your Charter, is a fiery expression against «dependence», «human dignity» in your Charter is a fiery expression against «human indignity», and «sovereighty», which is one of the cornerstones of the United Nations Charter, is a fiery expression against «colonialism» and against «imperialism». The whole Charter is an instrument of a fiery expression.

Let me remind our distinguished colleague of the United States : what is the problem of «racial discrimination» in the United States when it is not a fiery expression for equality of the people, for human equality here in the United States ? The racial conflict in the United States was not treated with frigid expressions, frozen as a fish, but was treated by President Kennedy himself and by the rest of the leaders of the United States, whether they be negroes or otherwise, with fiery expressions. We should not stigmatize our statements as being fiery. If anything is to be stigmatized, it is the policy of the United States which led to this fiery situation and caused the fiery statements in the United Nations.

What would your statements be, my distinguished friend of the United States, if you had a hundred million refugees in the United States ? I say a hundred million refugees because this is the proportion of our refugees, the proportion to our population. It is over half of the population of Palestine who are now refugees in exile. If you apply this proportion to the United States population, do you know what that means ? If you have such a refugee problem, it means a hundred million American refugees. If you have such a problem with such grave dimensions, would you come here to the United Nations with a frozen language and frozen expressions, so sweet and so gentle, and speak of this gigantic problem ? I say «no», you would not do that. I am sure you would not do that and we have precedents.

Let me remind you of the statements of Ambassador Lodge. A few years ago, here in the Assembly when he was dealing with the item regarding the eleven American airmen who were held in «Red China», the whole session of the United Nations was overtaken by the passions and sentiments of Ambassador Lodge, although we all of us know that Ambassador Lodge is passionless and sentimentless — not out of discourtesy, but this is his behaviour, these are his manners; he is a man with a cold mind, but with a warm heart. But still he came to the United Nations to plead the cause of eleven — simply eleven, not a million and a quarter refugees — eleven American airmen held

in «Red China». He turned the whole United Nations Assembly into a hell against «Red China» because these people were detained for a few days, and he appealed to the world that these people should be joining their families at Christmas.

Well, how many Christmases have passed which we have not enjoyed in our Holy Land? Fifteen years have passed without our being able to be in our homes and to enjoy Christmas as the United States representative wanted the eleven American airmen to enjoy their Christmas in their homes. Are we not human beings too? Are we not entitled to a holy Christmas, and to enjoy it as you do? That was the appeal of Ambassador Lodge, but that might be an ancient story. Let us come to a more recent story, and we come to Ambassador Stevenson, a man of presidential talents, a brave man, a man of great qualities.

You remember, during the Cuban crisis, while he was seated in the Security Council how he put a question to the representative of the Soviet Union, asking him: «Answer me, yes or no», and he did it with a great deal of emotion and of passion, and very coldly the representative of the Soviet Union did not answer. And again, Ambassador Stevenson said: «Answer me, yes or no?», shouting; and again the representative of the Soviet Union refused to answer, and then Ambassador Stevenson burst out and said: I shall wait for the answer until Hell freezes over.

Is this not a fiery statement? Is this not fiery oratory. It is more than a fiery expression; it is a hell expression, quoting hell until it freezes over, and God only knows when hell freezes over. Then here comes the representative of the United States to speak of fiery expressions, forgetting that the diplomats of the United States not only go to fiery expressions, but to fiery adventures when the situation calls for it.

Let me invite the attention of the Committee to that portion of the report of Mr. Davis, when he referred to 325,000 persons living in starvation, 7,000 of them — the Azazmeh tribe — visited with tuberculosis, and here I am employing the very terms of Mr. Davis' report: visited with tuberculosis on the verge of starvation and, I would say, on the verge of death. This is climination, this is genocide, and yet we are called upon here to come and speak our mind in a manner which discloses no passion and no sentiments. Three-hundred twenty-five thousand people are being described in the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, and particularly the 7,000 Azazmeh, who come from the Negeb wherein, I told the Committee, they owned 99 per cent of the land, as endangered by tuberculosis. Yet the representative of the United States comes with this sweet advice to us not to use fiery oratory.

I know of no refrigerator here in the United Nations for us to go and cool off our persons and our sentiments so that we may come here as frozen

fish, to say nothing of our sentiments. Our passions are a reality, one that must be taken account of by the United Nations.

I have heard it stated that the properties of the refugees have been seized under Israeli legislation. My answer is simple: this is genocide by legislation. So far Israel has promulgated six legislative enactments to dispose of the properties of the refugees. They are law only by title for they defeat the very concept of law, and have no room in the sanctuary of law, just as the **apartheid** legislation of South Africa is not law. The Committee is familiar with the legislation of South Africa; they are entitled law, but they are denounced by all jurists of the world as being not law; and the Israeli legislation all in all falls in with the South African legislation.

The refugees are not absentees. They are expellees, expelled by Israel. Israel expells the refugees and defines their status as absentees. This is not absence on the part of the refugees; it is the total absence of human conscience which condemns them as absentees. Under Israeli legislation, even an Arab within Israel who moved from one part of the city to another is considered as an absentee, and therefore subject to be dispossessed of his property.

According to Don Peretz, an American author who made a thorough study of this subject:

> «Every Arab in Palestine who had left his town or village after November 29, 1947, was liable to be classified as absentee under the regulations. All Arabs who held property in the New City of Acre, regardless of the fact that they may never have travelled further than a few meters to the Old City, were classified as absentees. The 30,000 Arabs who fled from one place to another within Israel, but who never left the country, were also liable to have their property declared absentee. Any individual who may have gone to Beirut or Bethlehem for a one-day visit during the latter days of the Mandate was automatically an absentee.»
> The speaker is not an Arab source. He is an American authority with a free and independent mind.

Thus, in accordance with Israeli legislation, if you move within New York from uptown to downtown, you are an absentee, and your properties are liable to confiscation. You could even be an absentee if you moved from the delegates' lounge to the Security Council, and you are liable to have your property confiscated by Israel were it not for the United Nations privileges and immunities.

This is an occasion for us to remember that under the Nazi regime, the Jews were expelled from their homes and dispossessed of their properties. In Nazi Germany and in all European countries overrun by Germany, a number of laws were enacted to legalize the robbery of Jewish property. But with

the destruction of Nazism, the conscience of Europe revolted, and the whole world raised its voice against this tyranny. All those Nazi laws, we recall, were condemned as brutal, uncivilized and savage. They were rescinded by all the Governments of Europe, when Europe was freed by the Allied Powers, Various national laws were passed to sweep away those Nazi laws.

In the United States — and to this I invite the attention of the representative of the United States — Occupied Zone of Germany a «General Claims Law» was passed on 9 August 1949, which declared that those who suffered damage to property under Nazi Germany, because of racial or religious or ideological grounds, shall be entitled to restitution of property. The Jews have, in fact, made the best of this United States legislation.

In the British Zone of Germany — and to this I invite the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom — a law under number 59, entitled «Restitution of Property to Victims of Nazi Oppression», was passed on 12 May 1949. Article I of this law provided for the speedy restitution of property to persons, whether natural or juristic, who were unjustly deprived of such property «for reasons of race, religion, nationality, or political views». The Jews were the first to benefit from this British legislation.

As for the Axis and Axis-occupied countries, various laws have been passed for the restitution of property belonging to victims of Nazi atrocities, and Nazi legislation was abrogated. I here call the attention of representatives of those countries.

In France, the Decree of 14 November 1944 provided for the restitution of Jewish property.

In Romania, the law of 19 December 1944, dealt specifically with the restitution of all Jewish property rights.

In Italy, the Decree of 5 January 1944 provided for the reinstatement of Jewish property rights.

In Bulgaria, the Decree-Law of 24 February 1945 stipulated the remedies for the material consequences of the abrogation of anti-Jewish laws.

In Czechoslovakia, the Decree of the President of Czechoslovakia of 19 May 1945 declared the nullity of certain property transactions made during the period of bondage and the «national administration» of properties belonging to Germans, traitors, collaborators, and certain organizations and institutions.

In Holland, the Decree of 17 September 1944 was so comprehensive that it tackled the problem under the title «Re-establishment of Justice» — and the refugees, under that paragraph of the draft resolution now before you (A/SPC/L.99), ask for nothing more than the re-establishment of justice, to employ the words of the Holland legislation.

In Yugoslavia, the law of 24 May 1945 detailed the procedure for property, the owners of which were forced to leave at the time of the occupation, as well as with the property seized by the occupants and their helpers.

All these laws were hailed by the civilized world. They are now part and parcel of our modern international law that gained universal recognition. Such European laws are in essence a nullification of the Israeli enactments regarding the properties of the refugees. The conscience of Europe and European peoples was moved in respect to Jewish property, and restitution was the remedy. These were the early fruitions of the Second World War, through the United Nations who gave their name to the Organization of the United Nations. Will the conscience of the United Nations be moved and, indeed, will the conscience of mankind be awakened to protect the property of Arab refugees, as Jewish property was protected? This question has been waiting for an answer for the last fifteen years — and is still waiting for an answer — with justice and with equity and with fairness.

The United Nations is duty bound to protect the rights and interests of the refugees. Arab property and Arab revenues should be handed over to the refugees. In 1947, the United Nations wrongfully assumed jurisdiction in the question of Palestine. Having done so, the same United Nations cannot now sit back and say: I have no jurisdiction. Having assumed power, and acted on that power, and on the strength of that power, you are estopped today from claiming that you are powerless. Having intervened in 1947, you are estopped from sitting back in 1963 simply to witness the tragedy. It is the minimum of justice that you should undo the injustice that has been done. With Arab property restored, you would be relieved of this great financial responsibility now burdening United Nations Members. The refugees would live on their own — not on charity, gratifying as it may be, for charity is damaging their human dignity. Mercy is not what we ask. We demand our rights, our inalienable rights. The United Nations is duty bound to restore our rights, if the United Nations is to be worthy of its Charter and the sublime principles enshrined in the Charter. Our rights must be protected an safeguarded, and this is the duty that can be and should be discharged by action of the United Nations, and not simply and only by a verbal resolution. Whether it be through a custodian, or whether it be through the good offices of U Thant, your great international executive, or wether it be through Mr. Davis or his successors, or any media whatsoever, action must be taken to restore Arab property and pay the income of the refugees.

These rights of the refugees — even speaking from the angle of the United Nations — are provided for in the United Nations resolutions; they have been reiterated by the General Assembly for the last fifteen years. Even in the 1947 resolution — and here I speak from the angle of the United Nations — there are three chapters in that grand resolution providing for the protection of the rights of the refugees, the rights of the Arab people to their lands, to free access to the Holy Places, to their properties; all human rights

have been stipulated in detail in three long chapters in the 1947 resolution. So you cannot now sit back and say: I have no jurisdiction, I cannot interfere because the land is held under Israel, and Israel claims sovereignty. I say, Israel has no sovereignty over the matter, because from the very beginning — from the very genesis of the problem — in 1947, you had stipulated so many provisions, enumerated in three distinctive chapters, for the protection and safeguard of the rights of the Arabs to their property, and to human rights. Now that you have assumed jurisdiction in 1947, you have assumed competence in 1947, you cannot now sit back and say: I am powerless, I have no jurisdiction, the land is under the sovereignty of Israel. And, mind you, let me remind you: even under the 1947 resolution, Israel is without jurisdiction over the matter; Israel has no competence in the matter; Israel is the only Member State in the United Nations whose constitution has been provided by the United Nations.

You all know that your constitution is your own making; it is the expression of the will of your people. You have framed your constitution. But, with regard to Israel, the constitution of Israel has been framed by the United Nations resolution of 1947, which said that Israel cannot legislate against the properties and the human rights of the people of Palestine. So there is a veto against Israel; a veto by the United Nations General Assembly resolution, that Israel cannot make any legislation or take any measure which would affect the rights of the people to their property or their human rights.

The question of the properties of the refugees, I should like to remind our colleagues from the United States, is not a contentious proposal. I heard him say in his statement that he does not wish to see revived contentious proposals. I am really at a loss; I do not know how to define a contentious proposal. What is a contentious proposal? It seems to me that the United States would denounce any proposal as a contentious proposal, because it is not to the liking of Israel. This is the criterion for the United States to judge whether a certain proposal is contentious or otherwise.

Where was this wisdom of the United States to avoid contentious resolutions and contentious proposals? Where was the wisdom of the United States in 1947 when they whipped up the United Nations to adopt the most destructive and contentious proposal for the partition of Palestine and for the establishment of Israel? Was the establishment of Israel something accepted by the world or by the people on the land, by the people themselves, the rightful owners? It was a contentious proposal. We contended at that time that it is not the right of the United Nations to partition our land and to set up an alien State in our land. That was a contentious proposal.

We advised the United States not to go ahead, and we said this is not only contentious, but it is most destructive and most subversive. They did not accept the advice. Where has this wisdom been conceived? Why was that wisdom not in the White House? It was absent when Israel was born in the White

House, on the very bed of the White House, let me say that with all chastity. Where was that wisdom? It is only discovered now, as though it is the discovery of America in the Middle Ages. They only discovered the wisdom of «contentious proposal» just at the eleventh hour when the damage had already been done: when the refugees have been exiled, they have been expelled, thrown out of their country, and then after fifteen years the great distinguished representative of the United States, full of the wisdom of Solomon, comes to say: We do not want to revive contentious proposals. Well, the proposal for the refugees' properties is not contentious; I do not say that. You have the Clapp Mission, Probably many of our colleagues here do not know what the Clapp Mission is.

The Clap Mission is a mission which took its name from its Chairman, Mr. Clapp. He is a great and distinguished United States citizen. He was the Chairman of the mission that was dispatched by the conciliation commission to survey the question of Palestine refugees on the spot. Well, then, he came out with a proposal. He was speaking about the 325,0000 people who are cut off by the Demarcation Line from their lands, from their grazing lands, from their wealth — 325,000 people residing in 118 towns and villages cut off by the Demarcation Line from their lands .They cannot farm them. They cannot pasture their cattle in the grazing land. They cannot go to their wells, the only source from which they can obtain drinking water where they can water their animals.

Mr. Clapp has reported to the General Assembly. He has tabled a resolution. This is a United States citizen, dispatched with a mission to study the question of the refugees and particularly those people, the 325,000, who are now landless, who cannot live, who are not on the rolls of Mr. Davis, because they cannot go to their lands and farm their lands. You know the Demarcation Line has cut off villages from their lands, cut off people from people, a cousin from a cousin, a father from a son. And even a hospital has been bisected by the Demarcation Line. One side of it is on the Israeli border, the other side on the Arab border. These are the Demarcation Lines about which Mr. Clapp has been complaining.

You even have a school on the Israeli side, and the children come from the other side; and nobody grumbles in the United States. The only grumble we hear is when one or two persons come from East Germany to cross the border into West Germany, and they are shot down and killed. This is the only thing we hear here in the United States and read in the United States papers. But what the Demarcation Line is doing in the Holy Land is not the concern of anybody here, and, particularly, the delegation of the United States.

Well, this is not a contentious proposal, I say, because Mr. Clapp has proposed the following to the United Nations:

«The problem of the refugees in the Gaza area» — these people who are cut off by the Demarcation Line — «will not be solved, save by permit-

ting them to farm their adjacent lands from which they are now cut off by the Demarcation Line.»

This is a proposal by the Clapp Mission, a United Nations body, a United Nations organ, presided over by a United States personality, proposing that the problem of those people can only be solved if they are permitted to farm lands across the Demarcation Line. If you do not like contentious proposals, kindly like the proposal of a United States citizen, who, incidentally, is the Chairman of a United Nations organ. Can you say a United Nations organ proposal is contentious? I do not think you would go as far as that.

Well, if you do not like the Afghanistan proposal, I appeal to you that you should please like the proposal of Mr. Clapp. And I appeal to you that you should table a resolution asking that those people should be allowed to farm their lands across the Demarcation Line, because this is the only solution, as Mr. Clapp has indicated. But I am sure that you will not like it because of the so many hundreds and thousands of dollars paid to American institutions to poison your mind and the policy of the United States on the question of the refugees. And I do not blame you for that.

United Nations action is the more necessary since the problem of the refugees is growing in gravity and intensity. The regretted resignation of Mr. Davis is a silent protest against the inaction of the United Nations or — to put it more precisely — against those Powers who are backing Israel with economic and military assistance. The policy of those Powers, we know, is outside the ambit of the present item, except in one aspect, namely faithfulness to the United Nations and to the United Nations resolutions. Having voted for those resolutions, you cannot extend economic and military assistance to a Member constantly and persistently defying those resolutions. And how can Mr. Davis achieve any progress when a great Power like the United States continues to provide Israel, behind the back of Mr. Davis, with every form of assistance, including nuclear power?

It is no wonder therefore that Mr. Davis should resign, as did resign all his predecessors. Instead of performing their mandate, the directors of the Agency are resigning, without exception, one after the other.

The number of the refugees is growing year after year and there is no end in sight. In fact, since the United Nations was seized with the problem, the number of the refugees has been increasing from session to session. It appears as though the United Nations is nursing the problem and fostering its growth. Instead of decreasing the number of the refugees is increasing, and Israel is the author of the whole drama, from beginning to end. It was through Israeli expansionist policy that additional refugees have been added to the list. I find no better evidence than the record of Israel.

In the early reports of the United Nations, some 30,000 refugees were

estimated to have left the country in 1947. That was before the termination of the British mandate and in the wake of Jewish territorism. After the ghastly massacre of Deir Yassin in April 1948, the number of the refugees was stopped up from 30,000 to 200,000. After the establishment of Israel and with Israeli terror continuing, the United Nations Mediator reported the increase of the number of refugees to 400,000. With Israeli aggressions and violations continuing, the number of the refugees was reported to be 900,000 in 1950. Ever since, the number of the refugees has been increasing until today. Mr. Davis reports the number of the refugees up to June 1963 to be 1,210,170. He did not count the whole number. The number of the refugees is increasing. One would naturally assume that with the lapse of years, a United Nations problem, any problem, should be diminishing and in the process of liquidation. Instead of contraction, we find the refugees problem in a process of constant expansion and increase. From 30,000 refugees in 1947, the refugees' number was inflamed to 1,210,170 for the year 1963. The one single reason behind this phenomenon is Israel: Israeli massacre, Israeli military raids, Israeli violations of the armistice agreements, and, in a word, Israel's very existence.

I say Israel's very existence, as a cold and well-calculated conclusion. When the Jewish State was proposed by the United Nations, a paradox was discovered. It was revealed that the proposed Jewish State with all the skill of boundary drawings, did not contain a Jewish majority. The Arabs in the Jewish State were equal in number to the Jews — except that the Jews were 1,000 in excess, 1,000 souls in excess. These are the United Nations figures and God only knows how far this figure, 1,000 souls, is accurate without an actual census.

How could it be a Jewish State with such an Arab population ? This was the big question. The answer for Israel was very easy and simple. These Arabs must be exterminated and expelled. The Arabs were, in fact, exterminated and expelled, and the Deir Yassin massacre of 1948 was only the beginning.

I say the beginning, for Israeli military raids against defenceless Arabs continued unabated in spite of successive condemnations passed by the Mixed Armistice Commission.

Of those which contributed most to the rise in the number of refugees, let us mention the aerial bombardment of El-Hemma village in April 1951, the attack against Falameh and Rantis in 1953, the attack against Idna, Surif and Wadi Fukin in 1953, the aerial bombardment of the Gaza bedouins in 1953, the attack on Qibya, Shugba and Padrus in 1953, the attack on Nahalin in 1954, the attack on Azzun in 1954, the attack on Esit Ligya in 1955, the attack on Gaza in 1955, the second attack on Gaza in 1955, the attack on Khan Yunis and Bani Suheila in 1955, the attack on Sabha in 1955, the attack on the east side of Tiberias in 1955, the attack on Gaza in 1956, the attack on Khum ar-Rihan in 1956, the attack on Rhawa in 1956, the attack on

Gharandal in 1956, the attack on Sharafi in 1956, the attack on Kalkilya, Azzum, Nabi Ilyas and Khan Sufin in 1956, and, most recently, the attack on Twafcek in 1960.

However in the course of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly — to be exact, on 18 October — Israel was condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission for infiltrating to Jordan across the armistice line and killing a member of the National Guard.

These villages that were attacked by the Israeli military forces are not vacant; they are inhabited by their people, by us. It is only natural that these people would become refugees when their homes are dynamited, when their plantations are set on fire, and when their cattle are killed and robbed. When our homes are destroyed, when our villages are attacked and robbed, it is only natural that we become refugees; and it is only natural that the number of refugees increases year by year. The natural consequences are obviously clear — the inhabitants must become refugees, and Mr. Davis will have to feed them, Mr. Davis will have to shelter them, and Mr. Davis will have to feed and shelter their children. Israel dynamites and destroys, and Mr. Davis will have to feed, shelter and relieve. This is the equation in the area.

In addition to these military raids, the cause of the increase in the number of refugees, Israel has invaded a number of the demilitarized zones and expelled their Arab inhabitants. More refugees were added to the list.

In his report to the Security Council, General Bennike, Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization, stated that in May 1951 Israel expelled 1,000 Arabs from the El Auja demilitarized zone; in 1953, 250 more were expelled; and, in March 1951, 785 Arabs were expelled by Israel and were removed from their homes.

General Riley, another Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization Commission, reported in September 1950 that Israel had rounded up 4,000 Bedouins of the Negev and drove them out into Egyptian territory. In March 1950, Israel expelled 1,000 Arabs and drove them out into the Gaza Strip; in July and September 1950, 756 Arabs of Al Majdal were expelled into Egyptian territory.

All these thousands of people have become refugees and have contributed to the increase in the number of refugees, to the burdens of Mr. Davis and to the burdens of the international community which is extending financial assistance to these wretched people.

In the demilitarized zone along the Syrian frontier, Israel removed 650 Arabs from their villages. In spite of Security Council resolution of 18 May 1951, those villages were not repatriated; they became refugees, packed in concentration camps under the most miserable conditions. In July 1955, the Chief of Staff described their living conditions as follows :

«These people are living under very bad conditions; more like beasts than men.»

All these Israeli aggressions and violations have made an inglorious contribution to the increase in the number of refugees. We fear this increase is in the process of further increase. The Arabs within Israel seem to be the immediate target; it appears they are on the waiting list to become refugees, adding numbers to numbers and a tragedy to tragedy.

In a dispatch to **The New York Times** of 26 September 1951, the Arab Deputy Mayor of Nazareth asserted that 250,000 acres of Arab land had been taken by Israel from its Arab owners. The conclusion is irresistible; robbed of their property, these Arabs become landless and, as such, they are eligible as refugees — a new burden to be shouldered by the international community and, personally, by Mr. Davis or his successor. And I call the attention of our colleague from New Zealand, who spoke yesterday about the Arab minority in Israel, that this is a dispatch from the **New York Times** on the subject of 250,000 acres of Arab land being robbed from its owners. Robbed of their land, they become refugees. This is the status of the minority in Israel to which my distinguished friend referred. You better consult the record before you speak to the Assembly on the status of the Arab minority in Israel. This is only a passing remark so that my friend from New Zealand may know and examine the situation from all aspects before he addresses himself to this problem.

But the matter did not stay with dispatches of **The New York Times.** The matter was so serious that it was brought to the attention of the United Nations. In a petition, signed by ten Arabs from Israel, addressed to the President of the General Assembly on 10 November 1960 — and I ask you, my distinguished colleague and friend from New Zealand, to go to the archives of the President of the General Assembly and read that petition, signed by Arabs living in Israel, part of the Arab minority to whom you referred — it was stressed that 315,000 acres of Arab land were taken from their owners and given to Jewish immigrants to establish their communal settlements.

In four villages, I would point out to my distinguished friends in New Zealand, two Moslem — Khass and Galameh — and two Christian villages — Kafre Birium and Igrit — the inhabitants were forcibly expelled from their homes. In the case of the two Christian villages, the Israeli armed forces razed the buildings to the ground. In Shaab village, in western Galilee, a large number of the inhabitants were expelled from their homes. They were forbidden to return to their lands and homes. The Arabs of Beersheba in the South are confined to encampments, and their lands were allotted to Jewish settlers. An Arab endeavored to offer his legal advice to these victims was refused permission to proceed to their encampment. This is the gist of the memorandum now lying in slumber in the archives of the United Nations and I ask you,

gentlemen, to read it and ask Israel about it. Yet, I am afraid, the matter is not at an end.

Another source for a further increase in the number of refugees is Jewish immigration. The more Jewish immigration, the more Arab refugees there are.

In October 1962, and this is a very recent report, **The New York Times** quoted Mrs. Golda Meir's hope that Israel's population would increase by a million in 1970 and by still another million in the decade to follow. These are the hopes and aspirations of Mrs. Golda Meir, who speaks for peace here in the United Nations — hope for a million in 1970 and another million in the decade to follow. Is this the language of peace ? This is no immigration; this is no human movement; this is an invasion pure and simple.

In this regard we must recall the prophetic words of Count Bernadotte on the subject. The United Nations Mediator, Count Bernadotte, in his report to the Security Council dated 12 July 1948, said — and Dr. Bunche is here to testify to the quotation I am making from Count Bernadotte's report, and I suppose Dr. Bunche's pen is reflected in these words, in these very noble words, I would say :

«It could not be ignored that unrestricted immigration to the Jewish area of Palestine might, over a period of years, give rise to a population pressure and economic and political disturbances which would justify present Arab fears of ultimate Jewish expansion in the Near East ... It can scarcely be ignored that Jewish immigration into the Jewish area of Palestine concerns not only the Jewish people and territory but also the neighbouring Arab World». (S/888)

The United Nations should never fail to remember this warning, if the dangers of the problem are to be arrested, let alone expedite its solution.

This year, Mr. Chairman, — and I say this year with a heavy heart, and with a great deal of anxiety and alarm — this year we are witnessing another danger — a further increase in the number of refugees. This is not through massacre, this is not through immigration, but through religious persecution — through religious intolerance and through discrimination. Last year the world community was shocked by Israel's decision to refuse citizenship to a Jew, born a Jew under the name of Oswald Rufeisen, because he became a monk under the name of Father Daniel. In a sense, Father Daniel has become a refugee, although not on the rolls of Mr. Davis. But it seems that world indignation on this matter of Father Daniel did not have any bearing or any moral pressure on Israel.

Recently, and to be precise on 9 September, at the very dawn of this session, a brutal campaign of religious persecution was waged against the missionary schools and religious establishments in Israel. I will not go into the details for the news has received world-wide attention. — and you must have read it in the newspapers. It is enough to know that the Arab Archbishop

in the Greek Catholic Community in Israel was «molested and grossly insulted», to use the terms of the press reports. These religious establishments, which were the subjects of attack and persecution, in Israel, including schools, were the victims of this religious fanaticism, are Palestinian institutions, and the personnel, whether they be doctors, whether they be churchmen, whether they be nurses, or any type of personnel, are Palestinians. They have lived their lives in Palestine. They have served in this charitable enterpise throughout their lives in Palestine, serving the poor, serving their patients. These are Palestinians. They are simply persecuted because of religious intolerance, and this religious intolerance will add them to the list of refugees and overburden the burden of Mr. Davis, or his worthy successor. To persecute them simply means that they would become refugees. Amongst them are Arabs who have no government to protect or to shelter them. The British and French embassies in Israel have protested with regard to their nationals. But who is to protect the Palestinians before they are reduced to refugees? The Palstinians, as our distinguishd colleague from Iraq told you the other day, are the «sacred trust» of the League of Nations, and they are under the guarantee of the United Nations, under your resolution of 1947. Who is to protect those Palestinians from the religious intolerance now prevailing — not as a wind only but as a tempest — in Israel, against non-Jews, simply because they are Christians or simply because they happen to be Moslems. Israel is adding to the list of the refugees. Is it a great contribution Israel is making to the world to add to the list of the refugees by thousands and thousands; this is the inglorious contribution Israel is making after it seized its seat here in the United Nations. I know of no other contribution which Israel has been able to make before the United Nations, except this inglorious increase.

Israel, no doubt, will sugarcoat these atrocities. But the light sentences awarded to the offenders by the Israeli court for such an outrage cannot be sugarcoated. Nor can Israel claim innocence for these incidents. The chain of events proves the guilt of Israel and evinces a continuing system.

The question of the Holy Places in Palestine, the question of freedom of worship is one aspect of the present item, is one aspect of the refugees' problem now under consideration. The question of the Holy Places and freedom of worship has been of constant concern to the world at large and to the Vatican, in particular. One matter is relevant to the question of the refugees, and I shall refer to this matter only within this relevance. The Holy Places and sacred shrines are living institutions only in terms of people. It is the presence of the people which gives the Holy Places and sacred shrines their status, their life. Without the refugees, Christians or Moslems, the Holy Places and sacred shrines become desolate, they become obsolete. At best they are made into museums. In Israel many of our Mosques, many of our Churches have been closed, for the believers, the refugees, are not there, they are away from their mosques, they are away from their churches. Thus, the Holy Land is losing its holiness — its religious character. In a sense, therefore, the repatria-

tion of the refugees is a repatriation of holiness to these Holy Places, it is a rehabilitation of the Holy Land. What is at stake are hundreds and hundreds of churches, mosques and sacred shrines, that are really the spiritual possession of the world. And spiritual possession of the world, these hundreds of churches and mosques are bound to be reduced into museums if the refugees are not returned to their homes.

Apart from the national and political aspect of repatriation, I call your attention to the religious aspect of the refugee problem. I am not injecting a foreign element into the matter. The United Nations and its predecessor, the League of Nations, have always recognized the sacred and religious character of Palestine as a Holy Land. Various arrangements, we recall, have been stipulated to guarantee the safety of the Holy Places. But the Holy Places cannot stand on their own. The Holy Places can only be holy by the people — the people who had been for countless generations the guardians of the Holy Places. Jerusalem the holy, particularly the new Jerusalem, with its numerous religious institutions, cries out for its Christian and Moslem inhabitants, the refugees. Nazareth, of the Great Nazarene, of the Master, the messenger of peace, Jesus Christ, is crying out so loudly for its Moslem and Christian inhabitants, the refugees. So every silent church bell and every silent minaret in Israel is now in agony waiting for its people, waiting for the refugees.

If the refugees are to stay in exile, as Israel wants them to stay, Palestine will entirely lose its religious character. The Holy Land would simply become a historic term that belongs to antiquity. Palestine would be a mechanized farm, but a barren wilderness without holiness, and without significance in world history. This will be most revolting for the millions of believers all over the world. As keepers and legitimate owners, to us such an episode would be most catastrophic. And we shall spare no sacrifice to redeem the holiness of our holy land.

Repatriation of the refugees is, therefore, preemptory on all counts, including the religious consideration. It is a fact that Zionism has never concealed its evil intentions with regard to the Holy Places, whether they be Christian or Moslem.

This is an additional reason why the refugee problem is being perpetuated by Israel. When Sokolov, the Zionist leader, the head of the Zionist movement, president of the Zionist organization, paid a visit to the Vatican — and this was a historic episode, a truly historic and most telling episode — to secure support for the Jewish State, he met with Monsignor Barcelli and Monsignor Gasparri, the Papal Secretary of State. The Vatican — it is on record — expressed its deep concern over the Holy Places, and suggested firm measures to guarantee their safety.

Recording his reaction to the demands of the Vatican, Mr. Sokolov wrote — and I read to you this historic sentence for the information of all be-

lievers, throughout the world — «I felt a chill in my bones». «I felt a chill in my bones.» That was the response of Mr. Sokolov when he heard the demands of the Vatican for the safeguard of the Holy Places, and free access to the Christian and Moslem Holy Places. «I felt a chill in my bones.» This is what the Zionist leader said. Just ponder these few words: how meaningful and how dreadful they are.

It is this Zionist reaction: «chill in the bones», which caused the refugee problem, and it is this reaction which perpetuates the plight of the refugees. Sokolov now lies in his final rest, with no chill in his bones; it is the refugees in their cold camps, in fierce cold winter, who feel the chill in their bones — not in the figurative sense, but in all actuality, in all reality. I say in all actuality and reality, because the misery of the refugees is beyond the imagination, and no words are sufficient to describe their tragic plight. To realize the full depth of their suffering, you have to be an eye witness, to see for yourself the magnitude of the disaster. We, the Palestine delegation, on behalf of our people, invite the Committee, we extend an invitation to any delegation or any group of delegations, to come and see for itself the misery and plight of the refugees.

They will see men and women who are living characters in a drama old and infants, crowded in camps, within view of their farms and homes. What is the solution to this whole drama, to this whole tragedy?

I have addressed this Committee on this question for many years, in several capacities, and on this occasion in my present capacity as Chairman of the Palestine Arab Delegation. The only solution for the United Nations is the inalienable, inherent right of the refugees to repatriation, which simply means «re-patrie». **Patrie** means the homeland, and «re-patrie» means to go to the homeland.

But, regrettably enough, in the text of the United States statement — which was not, as I recollect, distributed to the Committee, and I had to request one of our journalist friends to secure a copy of the full statement, because the summary record was not sufficient for me to comprehend the United States position; it is still incomprehensible — we find these words, referring to the refugees:

> «... we must not falter in efforts for their early and effective re-integration into the life of the Middle East». **(A/SPC/PV. 402, p. 11)**

The position of the United States is one of reintegrating the refugees into the life of the Middle East. Whom are you reintegrating, Ambassador Cook: Are you reintegrating the nationals and citizens of the Arab States? Well, they can answer for that; I am no spokesman for the Arab States. Do you propose to reintegrate Ambassador Riad of the United Arab Republic, or

Ambassador Rifa'i of Jordan, or Ambassador Tarazi of Syria, or the rest of our colleagues? Certainly not. They will answer for that.

Do you propose to reintegrate us, the Palestine delegation and our people, into the life of the Middle East? What is the item before the United Nations? The question of the Palestine refugees, within the context of the Palestine problem. How dare you speak on the Near East? The problems of the Near East are not your business. In the Near East there are sovereign States, who are lords and masters of their own affairs. You cannot reintegrate us on their lands. This is their sovereignty and this is an act of independence. We will not be reintegrated on their lands and you are not to interfere in their sovereignty. This is the domestic affair for the Governments of the area, and you are not to dictate your will to sovereign States.

The problem is not before the United Nations — a problem which belongs to the Middle East. We do not see an item on the agenda of the United Nations entitled «The integration of the Middle East», or «A problem in the Middle East». The item before the Committee is the question of the Palestine refugees. So it is out of order, on behalf of the United States, to expand, so to speak, the item, to swell it, in other words, to include the frontiers of the Middle East. The Middle East is represented here and is not under the Mandate of the United Nations. The time has long passed since the people of the Middle East were under the mandate or the tutelage of any Power in the world, whether it be the United States, or any other Power. How dare you interfere in the domestic affairs of those Governments? This is one point.

Secondly, who are we? Are we a flock of sheep? Are we a herd of pigs, of animals, with no humanity and no responsibility, with no wishes and no desires? You just drive us like a flock of sheep, from one pastureland to another grazing land. You go and reintegrate yourselves in the area of the Middle East, in Syria, in Lebanon, in Iraq, and so on. We are a people with a will; we are human beings, as you are. We are just as much human beings as the citizens, the Negroes, here in the United States, who refuse to be reintegrated, for instance, in the South or in the North, in this state or in that state. We have a will; we are a people. We are entitled to our rights. We cannot be driven like pigs. We are not goats, belonging to this or that shepherd. We are our own shepherd. We are lord and master of our own destiny. We would like to live in our homeland and in our homes. We should like to live in Palestine, and die in Palestine, as our forefathers did. It is not for you to come and tell us to go and live in Libya. Why should I go and live in Libya? I do not want to go and live in Libya. I am not a citizen of Libya; I am not a citizen of the United Arab Republic. We are Palestinians, stateless as we may be we still belong to Palestine and Palestine belongs to us. We live there and we are determined to die there. It is not for the United States to come and propose the reintegration of the refugees — one and a quarter million people — you cannot just drive them, sweep them along like animals and tell them to go and live there.

I know of no precedent in modern history where a people have been bartered in this way. Please remember that we are — as you are — also a civilized people, as you are civilized. As you can see, we can speak English properly too.

But I do not wish to take up much of the Commitee's time. However, it is really very amazing to read, in the very last paragraph of the statement made by the United States Delegation a paragrph which, with all due respect, is, to my mind, the worst, the most damaging paragraph, in that statement. It is a very bad end. I would have liked the statement of the United States, to end with something glamorous which would show the power of the United States, the benevolence of the people of the United States, their attachment to democracy and to the wish of peoples for national self-determination — not a mockery and a travesty of the United Nations and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Let me read to you the last paragraph:

«Let us all — all the United Nations Member States around these tables — rededicate ourselves to an effort not only to assist the refugees to the full extent of our ability but to do all within our power to promote the finding of an honourable and just solution to this problem.» **A/SPC/PV.402,p.11)**

A miserable statement.

After fifteen years of efforts in the Conciliation Commission, a Member of this United Nations body comes and says «we must find a solution, an equitable and just solution». Why have you not found an equitable and just solution? What was the 1948 solution?

Paragraph II speaks of the repatriation of the refugees. My colleagues of Africa and Asia, I want you to know that that paragraph is the phraseology of the United States Delegation. They phrased that paragraph; they tabled that resolution; they voted for that resolution. This is the solution of the United States. It is not our solution: it is the solution of the United States speaking of repatriation. Now, after fifteen years, although we are in the wilderness of the United Nations in this international community, the United States seeks an equitable way.

We would like to find a solution. Well, the solution is there, and it is your solution. You made that solution part of the resolution of 1948. You voted for it and you asked in the United Nations General Assembly to support it and you come now and you want to find a solution. What about that solution? Will you answer this question? Do you believe that that solution is just and equitable? Well, if that solution is just and equitable, why are you here to come and say «we would like to find a solution», as though the solution was not found. What a great riddle and a great puzzle for the United States to discover. Is it a very strenuous problem that you are unable to discover such a solution based on justice and equity? Is repatriation not a solution which is based on equity?

To my mind, when the United States speaks of finding any solution after

fifteen years of efforts in the Conciliation Commission, I think the United States really could be condemned as having betrayed the mandate of the Conciliation Commission. The resolution of 1948 had established the United States as a member of the Conciliation Commission with a specific mandate to repatriate the refugees. You have failed in the last fifteen years to repatriate the refugees; you have failed to bring pressure upon your child, Israel, which was born in the United Nations, to repatriate the refugees. You come now in an attempt to discover a new solution to be based on justice and equity. You have betrayed your mandate, and if we are to employ the terms of law, you are disqualified as a Member of the Conciliation Commission. You cannot serve on the membership of the United Nations as long as you have disqualified yourself; you have departed, you have deviated from the terms of reference. Instead of implementation, you are looking for a new solution.

The mandate is to implement and the solution is found, the solution is decided upon. It was on your proposal and you are the author of that resolution. Now that you come and say you would like to find a solution with equity and justice, this is a serious deviation which calls for disqualification. I think that without anyone inviting the United States, the United States itself must find itself with all honesty away from the terms of reference and declare that it ceases to be a Member of the United Nations.

With honesty, if you think repatriation is not the course, if you think repatriation is not just and equitable, you must resign your duties under the Conciliation Commission. This is the honest course for the United States to follow. The major Power must come here to the United Nations and say «we are unable to go ahead with repatriation and therefore resign from it». In fact the Conciliation Commission, this antique body, the only body that has survived for fifteen years without any action, without progress, is not a United Nations organ, it is not a United Nations body.

In 1948 it was established to represent a Western colour, a Western shade. It has been described as being part of the NATO formation. I do not want to go to that length. But it certainly represents Western circles and Western sectors in the United Nations. It does not represent action; it does not represent Africa; it does not represent Latin America and in a word it does not represent the United Nations. It is either to be representative of the United Nations — and the socialist countries led by the Soviet Union should be represented together with our friends in Africa, with our friends in Asia and in Latin America — or it should be established as a neutral body, and we have so many neutrals in the United Nations who can carry the functions of the United Nations with honesty and with dignity.

This Organization, in its lifetime, had its ups and downs, its failures and successes. Many of the pitfalls were understandable and maybe forgivable. But the one problem which is never forgivable is the refugee problem, more so when it remains unsolved. It has been a chronic item, recurring on the United

Nations agenda one session after the other. It is high time that the problem be disposed of once and for all. But it would not be a real disposition, if justice is ignored and injustice is to continue.

Mr. Davis has told you, Mr. Chairman, in unequivocal terms and on so many occasions, that upon the solution of the refugee problem depends the peace and stability of the Middle East and hence the peace and stability of the whole world. The Palestine Delegation is here to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Davis is right, 100 per cent right; and that the United States Delegation is wrong, 100 per cent. We fear that this tone of peace now prevailing in the world could be disturbed at any moment if the present problem remains deadlocked in defiance.

What we ask is our right and nothing more and nothing less. This is no boundary dispute to negotiate or to compromise. Home, our home, is the heart of the matter — and a home does not admit negotiation or a compromise.

On our part, this is no stringent attitude. It is no obstinacy or inflexibility. By its very nature, home is not negotiable. I know of no one here around this table of 110 delegations who is prepared to negotiate his home or compromise his right to his homeland. So let it be with us now and for all time to come : we will not negotiate our home, neither will we compromise our homeland.

THIRD STATEMENT

PART 1

Made before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly at its 412th meeting, held on 19 November 1963, at 10:30 a. m.

(Source : U. N. Document A/SPC/PV. 412)

Mr. Chairman and honourable representatives, this morning I am making my concluding statement in the general debate. But before doing so, let me discharge three preliminary duties.

First and foremost, let me extend my sincere thanks to you, sir, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my delegation, on behalf of the people of Palestine, and, I dare say, on behalf of the Arab nations, for the excellent manner in which you have conducted the proceedings in this highly important and tragic problem. Your sense of responsibility, your high sense of impartiality, which is characteristic of the noblest traditions of your country, have been displayed so ably and so brilliantly in this honourable Committee.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I was Chairman of the Syrian delegation and later Chairman of the Saudi Arabian delegation, it was the merit of the alphabetical order that we used to be close neighbours, Syria and Romania. Now that I have a different capacity, let me say that our relations are of a more profound and deeper nature, because they are the relations of a nation with a nation, a people with a people, and a refugee nation with a people settled on their land and on their homeland. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, after the session you may go back home; maybe many of your colleagues here in the Committee may be going back home. But we do not go back home. Because our homeland is under the usurpation and military occupation of Israel, we go back to a life of exile as we have been living in the last fifteen years. And this is the most eloquent indication of our relationship with your people and with all freedom — and peace-loving peoples all over the world.

My second obligation is to extend my sincere thanks to the 110 delegations, including our distinguished colleague of Liberia, for their patience over our impatience, and, I would say, legitimate impatience. I say legitimate impatience because I should like to remind our colleague from Liberia that we, the people of Palestine, we the legitimate people of Palestine, have been included

in the Mandate System under Mandate A. Mandate A defines a country and a people worthy of independence, but in need to be prepared for an interval for independence and full sovereignty. All people under Mandate A have become fully independent, my distinguished colleague of Liberia, and all peoples under Mandates B and C have become fully independent and fully sovereign. And even people without a status at all — neither A nor B nor C, probably a zero status — have become fully independent and fully sovereign. We have not been deprived only of our liberty, only of our independence and of the right to be sitting here with our distinguished colleague of Liberia, as fully independent and fully sovereign, but we are being deprived of our homes and deprived of our homeland. With what finesse and what gentle words could a Palestinian citizen or a Palestinian delegation express his feelings, his sympathies, his emotions and passions and sentiments when he is uprooted from his home and homeland ? You will be going back some day to your country to enjoy home life, sitting in your home next to a fireplace, reading a novel or a piece of fiction, enjoying television, enjoying family life and all the amenities of civilized life with your people and on your land. But we do not go back to our homeland from this session. Even the delegation will not be united. We will go dispersed to different areas in the Arab homeland. We live in a broken-up existence. Fathers, sons, cousins, sisters, sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law have been disunited, broken up, for the last fifteen years, living in tents and camps. And still we are being called upon to speak gentle words and sweet expressions.

We would betray ourselves Mr. Chairman and my colleague of Liberia, if we did not speak our mind, if we did not speak our conscience and our sentiments. You said right now that we are human beings, that the refugees are human beings. If we are human beings, we must think and act and react as human beings. These are our sentiments and passions. And this is what we are. This is the rule of life. If you are angered, you are angry; if you are embittered — as Mr. Davis said — we must be bitter. When we are living in a brutal life, we cannot come here to the United Nations to sugar-coat our life and be as simple and as gentle as you want us to be. This is the rule of human life — to feel what you are, to think what you are, and to be what you are. You are quite happy in your homeland, so it is quite easy to extend advice to us. You are enjoying national life in your homeland; you represent a fully independent and a fully sovereign State. And I hail that. I acclaim that. I am happy that a State in Africa is well represented by the able speaker whom we have heard this morning.

I think we should be fair, we should be just, to the people who are now represented by the Palestine delegation.

My last tribute goes to the many delegations who have spoken in support of our cause. I should like to refer specifically, from memory, to the Pakistan delegation, to the delegation of the Soviet Union, to the delegation of Guinea, to the delegation of India, to the delegation of Afghanistan, to the delegations

of Bulgaria, and Indonesia and Mali. I hope I have not forgotten others, because one in a tragedy is bound to forget them; he is looking for those who antagonize his case. Our friends are there, but we are looking to respond and argue with those who are the antagonists to our cause, to our just and equitable cause.

I heard a very interesting lecture this morning by our distinguished friend from Liberia about negotiation. I respect our friend from Liberia, especially so since he has read to us those noble words from the Gospel, the New Testament. We, too, have a great deal of reverence and admiration for the Gospel, for the New Testament, because were are the people of the Holy Land ; we are the people who witnessed the Messenger of Peace; we are the people about whom the Gospel was written — its miracles, its teachings — with its sweet memories of our Jesus Christ, in our country, in our Jerusalem, in our Nazareth, in our Bethlehem. So we understand the Gospel, we admire it and we respect our distinguished colleague from Liberia for having directed the attention of the United Nations to the teachings of the Gospel, because they are teachings of justice and equity, not teachings of injustice and inequity.

It is quite easy to repeat the slogan «negotiation» — negotiation on this problem has become a slogan — but negotiation on the Palestine question and the problem of the Arab refugees is meaningless; it is without content and devoid of any import. With whom are we to negotiate ? Before you call for negotiations you must answer the question, the very pertinent question : Who is the other party ? Is the other party, by its policy, by its teachings, by its conduct, by its record in the United Nations as well as outside, a proper party with whom to negotiate ?

We have shown our record, documented evidence, that Israel is the offshoot of Zionism and imperialism, combined with all its evils and manifestations. One cannot negotiate with a subversive movement, with a destructive movement; one can negotiate only with a decent movement; one can negotiate only when the other party's policies, records, teachings and ideologies can coexist, because without coexistence there can be no negotiation, and there can be no coexistence with expansion. The United Nations cannot tolerate aggressors and aggression, and should not tolerate expansion and expansionists. One cannot negotiate with an aggressor, because that would constitute consecration of aggression. By its very nature, by its very tenets, the movement of Zionism is one of destruction, one of aggression, one of expansion, and it is not apt to be negotiable as a party. We cannot accept them as a party with whom to negotiate.

Let me read out the teachings of Zionism, the teachings of Zionist leaders, their tenets, their ideology. Can one negotiate with Nazism as a regime ? I know the Allied Powers, during the Second World War, refused and said : «We will not negotiate with Nazism unless there is a complete and final surrender». According to the Israeli Government Yearbook — and I always base my argu-

ments on the official records of Israel — of 1954, page 35, Mr. Ben-Gurion said : «When a Jew in America or South Africa» — Now, my colleague of Liberia, you referred to South Africa, so let me refer you to what Mr. Ben-Gurion said of South Africa, to the image Mr. Ben-Gurion has in his mind of South Africa. How does he think of an African State ? How Zionism, Israel, thinks of South Africa, African States and territory and the African people, your African countrymen ? This is the way he refers to South Africa and to Africans

« When a Jew in America or South Africa speaks of «our Government» to his fellow Jews he usually means the Government of Israel ».

Did you hear that, my distinguished colleague of Liberia ? When a Jew in South Africa says «our Government», he means Israel. You see, with such ideology and teaching one cannot negotiate with Israel. When Israel says your countrymen in South Africa are referring to Israel, when they say «our Government», they mean Israel.

Is this the way you want your African countrymen in the whole continent of Africa to think of Israel when they refer to their Government, simply because they happen to be Jews ? Judaism is a faith. I know there are many thousands of Jews who are living very progressively in the continent of Africa. Would you want those Jews, citizens of Africa, to become citizens of Israel and speak of Israel as their Government? Would you want a Jew in your country, a Liberian — by birth, citizenship and nationality — when he says «our Government» to refer to Israel rather than to the Government of Liberia, which is his Government ? — and his loyalty should be to his Government. Let me ask you for a moment, if you happened to be a Jew — now I am not very particular about this — when you say «our Government» would you mean Israel or Liberia ? This is the crux of the whole matter, the very foundation of Israel, its teaching and its policy. Does that make it a proper party with which to negotiate ?

Mr. Ben-Gurion continues, my distinguished colleague of Liberia :

«While the Jewish public in various countries view the Israel ambassadors as their own representatives...» —

This is the statement of Mr. Ben-Gurion, who says that the Jewish communities view the Israeli ambasadors as their ambasadors, that is to say, Mr. Comay here is the ambassador of the Jews in New York. I know of many Lebanese, thousands of Lebanese, living here in New York. I have never heard those Lebanese referring to Ambassador Hakim, the duly appointed representative of Lebanon here at this table, as being their ambassador; they never speak of Ambassador Hakim as «our ambassador». They speak probably of Mr. Stevenson as «our ambassador», or Mr. Plimpton, if he happens to be the one present in our Committee — yes, he has raised his hand; he is within my reach now; I can see him.

I will readily put the question to Ambassador Plimpton, whether he is the Ambassador of the United States, including the Jews of New York, or is it Mr. Comay who is the Ambassador of the Jews in New York. According to Mr. Ben-Gurion, it is Mr. Comay, not Mr. Plimpton. And this is a conflict of competence — I hope it will be solved some day — between Ambassador Plimpton and Ambassador Comay. You see, even the gallery is laughing at Mr. Ben-Gurion's proposition. It is laughable, really, and we are being asked to negotiate — everybody is laughing, laughing at the proposition, because it is based on a false foundation. Dr. Bunche, too, is smiling, and I know what is in his mind. Dr. Bunche's smiles are very intelligent, because he has a brilliant mind.

I have shown you, my colleague from Liberia, that Zionism and Israel by its very foundation could not be a proper party with whom to negotiate because it considers the whole of world Jewry as citizens of Israel. Are we to negotiate with the whole of world Jewry ? This is the position of Israel : Israel does not stand on its own. They are there because of military occupation in our land, but their citizens are over all the world.

We cannot negotiate with such an idea, with such a policy, with such tenets, because these are destructive, they are subversive, they create double loyalties. A Jew is asked by Mr. Ben-Gurion to have Israel's flag as his flag, to have his loyalty to Israel and not to the United States, and to have his President of Israel, and not President Kennedy. That is the whole philosophy and logic of Israel and the philosophy of Zionism. So how can you negotiate with such ideas ?

You have to think about it before you ask for negotiations. It is quite easy to speak of negotiations, but how applicable are they, how can you apply them to such a situation ?

You have been speaking about the Soviet Union and the United States negotiating between themselves. Well, the United States and the Soviet Union have their own rights, they are on their homeland. There is no boundary between them. There might be an ideological dispute, or a question of disarmament or armament, or nuclear or non-nuclear conventional weapons. This is not the case here. The case here concerns a homeland and a people whose homeland has been usurped and the people have been driven out of their country. This is the case pure and simple, and Zionism and Israel are not to be negotiated with, not only with regard to their doctrines, but also with regard to their ways and means. Their objectives are unlawful and their ways and means are unlawful. The ways and means of Zionism and Israel serve to invite persecution, to invite anti-Semitism.

Do not wonder, my dear colleagues here, if I make the affirmation that part of the policy of Zionism, part of the policy of Israel is to incite anti-Semitism, and incite persecution with a view to the ingathering of all the Jews from all over the world to Palestine.

We knew it as far bask as 12 August 1961 — and I invite the attention of my colleague from Liberia — Lord Cromer, a man of great talent, a man of great ability, wrote in the «Spectator» the following :

> «The most passionately ardent Jews prefer persecution, which keeps alive the flame of nationalism to emancipation, which tends to quench it».

This is the finding of a great and distinguished British statesman, who speaks of Zionism as being in favour of persecution, simply because it tends to bring about the ingathering of the Jews into Palestine.

My colleague from Liberia might say, well, this is a British view and it may not be applicable to the case now under consideration. I will bring him to a Jewish source, I will bring him to a Zionist source, a recent Israeli source, which shows that the tactics of Zionism and Israel are persecution of the Jews, and the incitement of anti-Semitism in the gentile world. Let us provoke this slogan of anti-Semitism in the gentile world so that the Jews will pour, will stream into Palestine.

I have here with me a very incriminating authority which shows that the tactics of Zionism and Israel are to align themselves with anti-Semitism and with all the evils of anti-Semitism. The most important utilization of the anti-Semitic outbreaks as a device to achieve Zionist ends is clearly revealed in an article in **Davar,** the official organ of the Socialist Labour (Mapai) party in Tel-Aviv. This is the publication of the ruling party in Israel, the organ of the Government, the semi-official organ. What does it say ? — I would like you to listen quite attentively and with a great deal of patience to me, when I read this portion to you. The article says :

> «I would select a score of efficient young men — intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with desire to help redeem Jews, and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction».

Probably, they may be sent to Liberia — or to any country represented here. The task of these young men in Liberia — or in any country represented here —

> «The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and, acting upon the brutal Zionism, plague these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew', 'Jew go to Palestine' and similar intimacies. I can vouch that the results, in terms of considerable immigration to Israel from these countries, would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries».

These young Zionists are being asked to go to countries where there are Jews, to probably put on the wall «bloody Jews», or in the streets, «Jews,

go to Palestine». These are the tactics of Israel and are being published by the **Davar,** the official organ of the ruling Government.

You all remember, Gentlemen, that campaign which overtook Europe and probably South America, where everybody got up in the morning to find written in the street «bloody Jew». You remember those phrases, «Jews, go to Palestine». You remember that campaign.

Now, you have to understand who the authors of that campaign are, who is behind that campaign : the Zionists, the Israelis.

What a party, my distinguished colleagues, that follows such tactics, that goes to Europe and South America with these slogans, in order to arouse anti-Semitism and influence the Jews to leave their countries and to go to Palestine. Such tactics are so vicious, so devastating, so subversive, that such a movement should be expelled from the negotiation table entirely, as being offside. You cannot play the game of negotiations in such a way. You cannot.

But let us get down to reality. My colleague from Liberia might say, well, these are theories, what are the practicalities of the situation ? Well, I will go along with him on this proposition, and find out how practical is the question of negotiation.

Well, a minute ago you said that we are human beings. It is very good that someone here has admitted that we are human beings. I thought we are goods, I thought we are commodities, we are articles in the market, that could be sold between a vendor and a buyer. I thought that we are a herd of sheep, or goats or pigs, that could be moved from one land into another. I am very much delighted that my distinguished colleague from Liberia speaks of us as human beings. But you are calling upon Governments to negotiate with respect to those human beings. You are calling upon Governments to decide our destiny, you are calling for negotiations between Governments to decide our future life. How on earth can you decide our destiny in our absence ? How on earth can you decide our future in our country, in our absence, between Governments, whether they are concerned or not concerned ?

It is our destiny, not the destiny of the Governments, concerned or not concerned. It is our future; if we are human beings we have a right to live, and we have a right to say, yes or no. We have a right to have a say in our future, and negotiations could not be conducted, when we have no say. Why do you not have all the Governments of the United Nations negotiating with regard to us, to our future, to our destiny ? Why is it only simply between the Governments concerned ? We are the people concerned. There are no Governments concerned in this question.

We are the 2 million people — the Palestinians — who must decide

our destiny ourselves, and no one on earth can negotiate on our behalf. This is our right. If you admit we are human beings, we should be treated as human beings, and as human beings we are entitled to negotiate our rights, our national rights. I do not understand, in the age of the United Nations, how a whole people can be placed on the negotiating table in their absence. This is not negotiation; this is simply a liquidation of a people and a liquidation of the rights of a people. We are in the age of liberty and democracy. How can one respect liberty and democracy and democratic principles when a people are denied the final word — when it is left to others to decide the destiny of a people ? This is the age of the principle of national self-determination. As you have enjoyed the right of national self-determination, we are entitled to enjoy our right to self-determination.

Let us turn again to the practicabilities and let me put before you, my colleague from Liberia, the report of the Conciliation Commission on this question of the refugees, to see how far negotiation will carry us on this problem. In its third progress report, of June 1949, the Conciliation Commission declared in unequivocal terms — and I shall read to you now a passage from the report of the Conciliation Commission, stating that «the Commission did not succeed in achieving the acceptance of the principle of repatriation by the Government of Israel». Here is the Conciliation Commission reporting to the General Assembly that it has not been successful in achieving even the acceptance of the principle of repatriation by the Government of Israel. What are we going to negotiate, in the face of this denial ? Israel denies not only repatriation but also the very principle of repatriation. Well, in the face of this denial, I wonder how you can call on negotiation in an area on the basis of denial, an entire and total negation of the right of the principle, of repatriation. And you are asking the Arab Governments to negotiate with regard to repatriation.

Now, and again as early as July 1949, Israel submitted to the Commission an official memorandum stating that the clock could not be put back. These are Israel's words — «the clock cannot be put back ... the individual return of Arab refugees to their former places of residence is an impossible thing » — and I underline «impossible thing». These are not my words. These are the words chosen by Israel, and the Conciliation Commission has reported these words to the General Assembly. When Israel says that the return of the refugees is an impossible thing, I wonder how on earth you can ask the Arab Governments to negotiate with regard to repatration, when we know beforehand that it is an impossible thing. Such negotiation, then, means we are to negotiate the impossibility. We are to negotiate an impossible thing. This is a fallacy; it is ridiculous. One can only negotiate when there is a possibility, but not an impossibility. You see why negotiations are being refused.

Our distinguished colleague from Syria, when he was explaining this

viewpoint, was not basing himself on a vacuum, or on air, but was speaking substantively. When Israel says it is impossible, how could it be possible by negotiation ? Negotiation is a practice for the achievement of the possible. It has been ordained in the Charter of the United Nations as a pacific way to achieve the possible, but when Israel says it is impossible, then negotiations cannot be called upon to achieve the impossible.

Again, in November 1955 the Israeli representative said «My Government could not approve or endorse Ambassador Labouisse's proposal that a procedure of free choice between repatriation and compensation be offered to the refugees...» You see we are a little bit in the dark, now, because we have been reading the Israeli proposition. It emanates from darkness — darkness of conscience. You see now, my distinguished colleague, that the Israeli representative said that these people — the refugees — do not have the right of free choice. Well, if these people do not have the right of free choice, what is the negotiation for ? It is quite incomprehensible it becomes an exercise, a gymnastic exercise, not a United Nations procedure. A United Nations procedure must have some semblance of life, and must conform to the realities, but now, beforehand, it has been blocked by Israel.

Well, I have another authority to put before you this is the gospel of Israel. I respect the Gospel you are reading, but let us see what the gospel of Israel is. The gospel of Israel which we have here is in the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, and I have its pronouncement for the year 1961. The **New York Times** reported as follows

> The Knesset voted overwhelming approval tonight of the Government stand that Arab refugees who fled should not be repatriated to the territory which has since become the State of Israel. In the same motion the Knesset gave its approval to a statement by Premier David Ben-Gurion of October 11, in which he rejected a proposal offered in the United Nations to give the refugees a choice of repatriation or resettlement.

This is the position of the Israeli Knesset, which is the Israeli Parliament. They rejected repatriation and rejected the right of the refugees to a choice between repatriation or resettlement.

Again, another decision was made in 1962 — in November — and I read it to you, my distinguished friend from Liberia. Here the cablegram is from Jerusalem and is dated 13 November, and it states

> After two days of intensive debate on Israel's general foreign policy, with heavy emphasis on the Arab refugee problem, Israel's Parliament, the Knesset, voted overwhelmingly here tonight a reaffirmation of the policy of the non-return of the refugees to Israeli territory.

This is the decision of the Knesset, up to 1962. I have given you this

lengthy record of the policy of Israel on practicabilities, on realities, not based on doctrines, not based on tenets, but actual policy, one year after the other, here in the United Nations and in the Parliament : non-return of the refugees. And we hear here in the United Nations the slogan of «negotiation», which means «non-return of the refugees».

The question is very serious indeed. The record of Israel, either in the United Nations or outside the United Nations, rules out entirely any resolution or any call for negotiations. We know what agreement with Israel means. There has been an Armistice Agreement with Israel, signed by all the parties concerned, under the auspices of the Security Council, and we know that that Armistice Agreement has been breached and violated hundreds and hundreds of times by Israel. But this is not the point I am after here. I put before you the following statement by Mr. Ben-Gurion to the Israeli Parliament on the occupation of the Sinai Peninsula. This is dated 8 November 1956. This is a statement made in the Knesset.

The Armistice with Egypt is dead, as are the armistice lines, and no wizards or magicians can resurrect these lines.

If an agreement, signed under the auspices of the Security Council, is being described in the Knesset by Mr. Ben-Gurion as being dead and no magician or no wizard can make a resurretion of those lines of that agreement, how on earth can you negotiate, with a party that denounces the Armistice Agreement held under the Security Council and pursuant to the orders of the Security Council? And you are asking us to go and negotiate with such a party?

There must be sense in every proposal, in every offer, in every suggestion that is made: not simply to fling it here on the table, throw it and just let everybody think about it. It is unthinkable; we cannot think of it.

In my first and second statements in this honourable House, I have presented the case of the Palestinian people in general and the case of the refugees in particular. It has been presented — and I say that with all modesty — with three f's: fully, freely and frankly. I have put before you arguments based on international law, based on the dictates of the Charter and the principles of the United Nations. I have quoted figures; I have quoted statistics; I have based myself on authoritative sources either from the United States Senate or from the Israeli Government year-book, which is available here in the United Nations. I have scarcely even put a press clipping because I have always based myself on these formal and official authorities.

What was the answer? With regard to the United States, I regret, no answer has been made at all. In my second statement I spoke for three hours quoting all United States authorities with regard to the various and serious charges that I have proffered against the United States policy and no answer to those charges has been made.

I most respectfully submit that it was not a **prima facie** case that I made, but a very conclusive and final one, to the last point of finality, supported by overwhelming evidence. And the distinguished representative of the United States simply confined himself to a brief reply, replying not to the subject matter, not to the charges that I levelled against the United States Government, but replying to my language and to my tone. It was said by the United States ambassador that I used abusive langugae, that my tone was bitter and that the United States does not want to dignify me with an answer. This is the most undignified answer: to speak in this manner and say that the United States does not wish to dignify me by any answer. I am a man of dignity and our delegation is a delegation of dignity and our whole people, the Palestinians and the Arab nation, are a people of dignity; dignity runs in our veins: so let it be known to the United States.

If there is any evidence as to our dignity and to our courage, it is our challenge to the United States. We represent the weakest people on earth and we are challenging the strongest people on earth. We are unarmed, as we are, we are poor, as we are, but we are here challenging the policies of the United States with its nuclear power and all its material resources. If there is any evidence of our dignity it is this dignity which gives us the courage to challenge the United States. No one can challenge the United States if it has no dignity and it has no courage to do it, and poor and unarmed as we are, we have done it with dignity and with courage.

I have proferred various serious charges to the United States that remain on record still unanswered. First of all I told of the findings of Senator Fulbright with regard to the briberies of Israel to the American institutions to poison the minds of the United States. I have referred in particular to the efforts of the Israeli agents, to draft declarations of Governors and mayors in the United States in support of the Israeli attitude; and this charge remains unanswered.

It would have been more honourable and more dignified for the United States not to not dignify me but to dignify the truth, the reality and veracity, and to answer yes or no as to whether the findings of Senator Fulbright are correct or incorrect.

I have charged the United States with regard to fallout — election fallout — with which the people, the refugees, are being showered day after day. I say we are being showered by election fallout : different statements made here in the United States, year in and year out, in the course of election campaigns. This charge stands unanswered by the United States delegation, whose representative simply confined himself saying that my language and my tone was abusive. It is not the language which is my concern — abusive or not abusive, it is not the language — it is the deeds which are to be condemned as abusive or not abusive. I have denounced the United

States policy as being abusive in its deeds. But it is not an answer to tell me that «your language is abusive» when its deeds are abusive.

I have charged that Mr. Ben-Gurion and Israel as a Government are reversing the decisions of the United States and on several occasions, too, I have quoted Mr. Ben-Gurion as saying that they have been able to reverse the decisions of the United States. I have asked for an answer but there is not yet any answer from the delegation of the United States as to whether Israel is able to reverse the decisions of the United States. We are concerned because those decisions which are reversed belong to the refugees and the right of the people of Palestine. Answer me yes, or no: Is Israel ready, is Israel always able to reverse your decisions with regard to our destinies, with regard to our future lives, our national aspirations and national rights? We are entitled to know.

And again, I have levelled the charge that the Conciliation Commission has committed itself to a serious misconduct, a violation of its terms of reference, a negation of the rights of the people to repatriation. And again I have charged the United States that the phrase at the very end of the statement of the United States representative spoke of re-integration of the refugees into the economic life of the Middle East. I said that plainly: this is a very serious violation of the mandate of the Conciliation Commission. The United States, should it be faithful to its own policy, must come to the General Assembly and say «well, we are unable to implement the terms of reference», rather than sleep over the mandate of the Conciliation Commission for fifteen years and come at the end of fifteen years to say «we are trying to discover a new solution». This is simply a hallucination. This is not a world of reality of which you are speaking. The solution is there, it has been decreed by the United Nations in 1948. You are the author of paragraph 11 of the 1948 resolution and as a member of the Conciliation Commission, faithful to the terms of reference, faithful to the paragraph you have phrased yourself, you must implement and not look for a solution. The solution is there, it lacks implementation, it does not lack discovery.

With regard to the abusive language, I am really sad to hear a great Power here represented in the United Nations invoke such a poor defence. I say it is a very poor defence indeed because you have to answer to the merits, answer my facts, answer my figures and statistics which are based on United Nations records. They are on the books of the United Nations or on the books of the Senate. I spoke for three hours; was it all abusive? I do not know if in the English dictionary there are so many abusive words that could be related and narrated in three hours before the Committee. I know the English language is very poor indeed, since it is very poor in abusive language. I wonder whether our distinguished colleague Mr. Plimpton knows that: he is highly versed in English.

Speaking for three hours, and then to come with a reply from the United States saying that my language is abusive. I did not use a language except the one which has been used by those noble American statesmen, distinguished citizens of the United States, whether they be men of responsibility or from any walk of life.

I would like to invite your attention to those statements. Dr. Millar Burrows in his book «Palestine is our Business», says the following:

«The vote for partition in the United Nations Assembly on November 29, 1947, was forced through by our Government.»

That is by the United States. It was forced by the Government, and how? Will you now decide whether this language, which is yours, is abusive? «(It) was forced through by our Government with a shameless resort to the time-worn methods of power politics.»

Would you consider the term «shameless resort» a gentle one or abusive language ?

And again he says:

«It was a shameful demonstration of the sad fact that the old morally discredited ways of unscrupulous pressure and diplomatic intimidation could control a body formed for the high purpose of achieving international justice.»

These synonyms which are used by Dr. Burrows — «shameless» in one respect, «shameful» in another respect, «morally discredited», and «unscrupulous pressure» — were not used by me. The terms which I have used are of a lesser degree. If mine are abusive then those of Dr. Burrows must be more abusive. It is a matter of taste, a matter of degree. I wonder, what is the taste of the United States delegation with regard to abuse and abusive? It seems that we differ on the terminology of abusive langugae. It is an abuse of the term «abusive language» to employ it differently. This is the abuse: to speak of it as abusive when it is firm and polite at the same time.

Let me put before you another authority. This time it is the Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal. In his diary he wrote:

«... the methods that had been used... to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely onto scandal.» **(The Forrestal Diaries, p. 363)**

The Secretary of Defense, speaking on United States policy in their pressure on the General Assembly in 1948, describes it as bordering onto scandal, and I say, it is scandalous. I said the other day that it is scandalous, that the conduct of the United States was scandalous, and here is the United States Secretary of Defense who speaks of United States policy as bordering «closely onto scandal». If the Secretary of Defense finds sufficient liberty, courage

and sincerity to speak of your policy as being scandalous, what can we say, we, the refugees, who have been uprooted from our homeland as a direct result of your policy?

Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, had foreseen that all-out support of Israel would leave scars of hatred and distrust» of the United States on the Arab world.

Your policy has left scars of distrust and hatred in the Arab world, and this is a reflection of my statement today, and I must say unequivocally that those scars of distrust and hatred in the Arab world are still prevalent. But this is not natural hatred. We do not naturally hate the United States. In fact, here I must distinguish our feelings about the United States Government and the people of the United States. We admire its people; we admire them for their tolerance, benevolence, chivalry and attachment to democracy, but we hate the policy of the United States, for its undemocratic and unscrupulous and scandalous policy on the question of Palestine, and I used the terms of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, in this question.

Let us remember that in 1947 Sir Zafrullah Khan, our grand jurist, gave warning to the world during debate in the General Assembly on the question of partition. He appealed to the Western world in these terms, saying, please, please, I beg of you. Do not ruin and blast your credit in the Arab world.

He warned you in 1947 not to ruin your credit in the Arab world and you did not heed his warning; the result has been distrust and hatred. We never hated the United States. Let me remind you that in 1919, following President Wilson's declaration of his Fourteen Points, the whole Arab world was moved with acclamation. We hailed the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, particularly with regard to the principle of self-determination, and when the King Crane Commission went into the country in 1919, we, the people of Palestine and Syria, 90 per cent of us, asked that they should be placed under United States mandate as an alternative to independence.

Do you see what great confidence we had in the United States Government? we asked that, as an alternative to independence, in 1919, we should be placed under the mandate of the United States. Now, that great credit of good will that prevailed in 1919 has become a zero at the present moment. That love of the United States Government has been turned into hatred and distrust, as Mr. Forrestal said in his diary.

We have another authority. I have before me a statement made by Congressman Lawrence H. Smith, speaking in the United States Congress. He said:

> «Let's take a look at the record,» — that is, the record of the United States in the General Assembly — «Mr. Speaker, and see what happened in the United Nations Assembley prior to the vote on partition.»

He goes on to say:

> «The pressure by our delegates, by our officials, and by the private citizen of the United States constitutes reprehensible conduct against them and against us.»

This is it: «reprehensible conduct» by the United States and by the officials of the United States in the undue pressure which was placed so heavily on the General Assembly in order to vote for partition and pass the resolution on partition.

At that time, there were only two reasonable and sensible suggestions before the General Assembly, and those two reasonable suggestions were ruled out by the United States Government, by the United States delegation. What were those two reasonable and sensible suggestions?

One was for a referendum to be carried out, so that the people of Palestine and in Palestine should be asked in a referendum to say what they want.

The second suggestion was to have recourse to the International Court of Justice as to whether the General Assembly is empowered to partition the homeland of a people against its own will.

Those two proposals were ruled against and defeated by the United States. The United States opposed a referendum. How can the United States be spoken of as having a democratic policy when it resists a plebiscite to ascertain the wishes of the people of a country ? And the second proposal, to have recourse to the International Court of Justice : we seek to go to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion as to whether the United Nations is empowered to divide one's homeland against the will of its people, to partition one's home against his wish; and still recourse to justice was defeated by the United States.

That is not all. The United States is not confined to the damage inflicted in the past, but it now stands with a charge of inflicting fresh damage in the question of the refugees. The other day, in his statement Ambassador Cook ended with the following, asking for a resolution asking for the reintegration of the refugees into the economy of the Middle East.

Well, the refugees do not belong to the Middle East. They belong to Palestine, and to Palestine they should return. They are citizens of Palestine, and as such they are entitled to return to their homeland. You cannot speak of the question of refugees as being part and parcel of the problem of the Middle East. We are not discussing the problems of the Middle East here. Neither are the problems of the Middle East within the competence of the United Nations or within the jurisdiction of the United States.

I should like to remind the distinguished representative of the United

States — as well as Mrs. Meir, because they seem to be in one camp; they have always been the spoiled child of the United States, so it is not a question of coincidence that they should find themselves in one camp — that Mrs. Meir said in her statement :

> « (Paragraph 11) speaks of 'reintegration', which later Assembly resolutions define as integration in the economic life of the Middle East. » **(A/SPC/FV. 410, page 21)**

You have this new combination between the United States and Israel speaking of reintegration into the economy of the Middle East. But reintegration is not a linguistic term; it is not such a term that you should go back to the dictionary and find out what is the meaning of «reintegration». This is a United Nations term; it is a United Nations terminology. You have to look for it in United Nations resolutions, and here I have before me United Nations resolution 393 (V) of 2 December 1950. Let me observe that the paragraph I am reading was phrased by the United States delegation; this is the paragraph of the United States, co-sponsored in that resolution by the United States, and tabled to the General Assembly by the United States. Operative paragraph 4 reads as follows :

> «Considers that, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, the reintegration of the refugees into the economic life of the Near East, either by repatriation or resettlement ...»

So reintegration into the economic life of the Middle East is not a term in its generality, but it is a term to be pinned to the choice of the refugees: those choosing to return must be repatriated, and those choosing not to return will be resettled. So it is reintegration not **in vacuo,** but reintegration either by repatriation or by resettlement.

We have it also from a valuable document by the late Secretary-General, Mr. Hammerskjold. This is an occasion for me to pay a tribute to his memory; he died in Africa for the cause of peace. But I hope that this document will not die in the eyes of the United States delegation, where he speaks of «reintegration» and gives to the General Assembly his interpretation of «reintegration». In his report to the General Assembly on the question of the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Agency — I have this document from the Secretary-General — and I read :

> «The question where reintegration should be sought has ... an important political aspect. In paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), the General Assembly resolved that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so».
> Then Mr. Hammarskjold said :

«The stand thus taken by the General Assembly would involve integration of the refugees into the productive life of Israel as well as of the Arab countries in accordance with the choice of the refugees ... Those wishing to return will be integrated in Palestine; those wishing not to return will be reintegrated in the Arab countries». **(Official Records, United Nations General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, Agenda item 27 (A/4121, para. 14)**

That is the interpretation of Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, with regard to reintegration ; it is not a novelty to which the United States is attempting to drag the whole General Assembly — a reintegration into the economic life of the Middle East.

And again, Mr. Hammarskjold said :

«No reintegration would be satisfactory, or even possible, were it to be brought about by forcing people into their new positions against their will.» **(Ibid., para. 17)**

Mr. Hammarskjold told the General Assembly that you cannot force those people into positions against their will.

It is our will which must have the first and final say. It is not the will of the United Nations ; nor is it the will of the United States. You cannot reintegrate the refugees in Syria, in Lebanon, or in Iraq. The refugees are determined to be reintegrated in Palestine, in their homes and in their homeland; this is their final say and this is their final position, and it is for the United States to abide by and respect the will of the people, if they want to be here representing democracy and representing the will of people and all the dictates of the United Nations Charter.

Having finished with this combination of Israel and the United States, let me come to another combination. This time it is the combination of the United Kingdom and Israel, and I think everybody is waiting for this combination to know its genesis, to know its history; and it would be quite useful for our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom to know the record of his Government on this question — the record of Great Britain with Israel, and the record of the British Empire with Zionism. The other day, he had been speaking in reply to our distinguished brother, Mr. Pachachi, with regard to the relation between Zionism and British imperialism — the relation between Zionism and international imperialism. He had volunteered an answer, but I submit, with all due respect, it was really a very poor answer, and it has proved the conviction rather than the defence. I should like to advise all representatives that when they speak on an item, they should study the record, and I think the United States delegation should study the record of the United Kingdom, the record of their policy, all over the earth, before they volunteer a statement here in the United Nations. If they do not know the record, let me tell them what is the record.

I said that Zionism is the heart of imperialism and colonialism, with all its evil manifestations. Mrs. Meir, the other day in her statement, said that «the Arab delegation are attempting to force on us the tag of imperialism and colonialism». Colonialism and imperialism is not a tag; it is not a label. We do not place such things as a label or a tag; it — Zionism — has been created in the lap of imperialism, moving from one lap of imperialist forces into another lap. It is not a tag. Zionism and Israel are the main product of colonialism with all its bad manifestations, with all its evil manifestations. And I have the record before me quite clear : Zionism from the very genesis has been trying to make alliance with all imperialist forces at the time of imperialism, in the age of imperialism. The Zionist creators were roaming all over Europe in order to seek alliance with the imperialist forces of the time; starting with France, the Zionist leaders submitted the following memorandum, and I read — to France they said :

> «The country we propose to occupy shall include lower Egypt, southern Syria and southern Lebanon. This position ... will render us ... masters of the commerce of India, Arabia and South and East Africa ... France cannot but desire to see the road to India and China occupied by a people that will follow her to death ... What people could be more suited to this purpose than the Jews, who were from the beginning of history destined for the same aim ? Frenchman and Jew, there is no doubt that they were created for one another».

You see, this is the language of imperialism, as submitted to France, with regard to India, the route to Arabia, the commerce of the sea — all this is the language of imperialism, as being submitted to France. But this is not the end of it.

The Zionist leaders moved to Germany, and to Germany the Zionist leaders offered their programme in the following terms :

> «We wish to establish, on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, a modern culture and commercial centre which will be both directly and indirectly a prop of Germanism».

To France, they said : We die with the French, we were created for each other we live for each other and we die for each other. Now, to Germany, they say : We will be the prop of Germanism.

> «Palestine, by Jewish immigration, could become a political and commercial base, a German-Turkish Gibraltar on the frontiers of the Anglo-Arab Ocean».

So they wanted to be the satellite of imperialist Germany, and they wanted to be the satellite of imperialist France — I say that with a great deal of respect to France, because France is no more imperialist and particularly

in that its great leader, President de Gaulle, now has entirely washed the history of France of the last relics and vestiges of imperialism.

Now this is with regard to Germany and France. What about Britain and the United States ? A letter dated 14 January 1918, from Weizmann to Brandeis, says the following :

> «A Jewish Palestine» — Weizmann writes — «initiated by Great Britain and supported by America means a death-blow to the combination of Islamo-Prussian-Turanian domination in the East ...»

This is another axis now. They leave the Prussians, they leave the Germans, they leave the French, and say to the Americans and to the English that «We, our combination, would be a death blow to Germany, to Islam and to Turkey». It is another imperialist axis entirely, another language spoken to America and to England. Then he continues :

> «For it must be abundantly clear that there is a complete coincidence of American-British-Judean interests as against Prusso-Turkish interests...»

Is that the end ? This is not the end. They submitted those terms to Germany, submitted those terms to France, submitted those terms to the United Kingdom and to the United States. But this is not the end. There is still a great power emerging after the First World War and after the Second World War. The Soviet Union — how can we approach the Soviet Union ? This is the last bastion. This is how they approached the Soviet Union. To the Soviet Union — and as recently as 1944 — Ben Horin, a well-known Israeli leader, spoke in the following terms :

> «By (encouraging Jewish immigration), Soviet Russia might not only gain the everlasting gratitude of many Jewish groups through the world ... but would also create for itself an excellent position in the Middle East».

They are offering the whole Middle East to the Soviet Union this time, as though they were the rightful owners of the whole Middle East. You see how Zionism, as an imperialist movement, is approaching the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, France and the rest. But we know that the Soviet Union would not adhere to this nonsense of encouraging Jewish immigration into Palestine in order to find an excellent position in the Middle East. We know that the Soviet Union is not after an excellent position in the Middle East, because the Middle East belongs to the people. The Middle East belongs to its people, and the Soviet Union is far from thinking of or contemplating having, for itself, a position in the Middle East by such propagandistic ways and means of Zionism. Zionism is being outlawed in the Soviet Union. I think that this is a sensible course for all the people of the world to follow, because Zionism is a destructive movement, a subversive movement. And the Soviet Union has done a great deal in the interest of peace and security of the world by outlawing Zionism as a devastating movement. This is a lesson to be fol-

lowed by all the remaining States and by the United Nations as a whole.

The Zionists were not confined to that. They approached the Ottoman Empire — because Palestine at that time was part of the Ottoman Empire. On 18 May 1901, Herzl, in his first interview with the Ottoman Sultan — it was Sultan Abdul Hamid — offered £1,600,000 sterling to secure a charter for Jewish colonization in Palestine. The Sultan, a sovereign of great integrity, rejected the offer and refused the bribery. The Sultan wrote as follows — and I am reading from the Encyclopaedia Britannica for the knowledge of our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom, who spoke the other day with regard to the relations between British imperialism and Zionism. I read from the Encyclopaedia Britannica. This is what the Sultan said to Herzl :

> «Advise Dr. Herzl to take no further steps in this matter. I cannot alienate a single square foot of land, for it is not mine, but my people's. My people fought for this land and fertilized it with their blood. Let the Jews keep their millions. If my empire is dismembered, they will perhaps receive Palestine gratis, but it must be our corpse which they cut up. I cannot agree to vivisection.»

This was the position of the Sultan — who is described by certain British circles as being a despot — refusing the millions of the Zionists, because the land belonged to the people. But, unfortunately, later on — we have it on record — the **jeunes Turcs** accepted that gigantic and colossal bribery. We have here Mr. Henry Morgenthau, who had returned to the United States after relinquishing his appointment as Ambassador to Turkey, referring to the Palestine question in a widely-publicized speech at Cincinnati. He announced that he had recently suggested to the Turkish Government that Turkey should sell Palestine to the Zionists after the war. This proposal, he said, had been well received and figures had been discussed. It is a question of sale. It is as though it was a farm to be sold. But here is a country, with a people. And Mr. Morgenthau, in a widely-circulated speech in the United States, spoke of his negotiations with the Turkish Government to sell and to buy — a question of transaction — a whole country with its people.

This is the obvious form of imperialism. This is the ugliest form of imperialism. And this is the most deadly manifestation of colonialism. When you negotiate with the Turkish Government with a view that, after the war, you will take the whole country by money, by dollars, by pounds sterling, with its people living there. It is worse than feudalism, when an estate has been sold with its peasants This is not an estate. It is a whole country, and the United States Ambassador, negotiating with the Turkish Government for the sale of the whole country, not a country that is ignored in history, not denied its significance in history. It is an ancient land, known as the Land of Peace, that has witnessed miracles of the Messenger of Peace, the Holy Land, intended to be sold by the United States Ambassador for money — with all its people, with all its possessions, with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre,

with the Church of the Nativity, with Nazareth the Holy, with Jerusalem with all its sacred shrines — to be sold to the Zionists for money through the negotiations of the United States Ambassador in Turkey. And here have been the bravery and courage to say that this is a «tap of imperialism» and that there is no relation between British imperialism and Zionism. This is imperialim by definition.

I should like to invite the attention of our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom again to the Encyclopaedia Britannica — to the latest edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. If he does not read the latest edition, because probably he seems to be a little bit old for the latest edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica — he might have some other edition — but the latest edition states as follows. The latest edition has linked Jewish colonization in Palestine with «.... the permanent security of the approach to the Suez Canal».

This is the kernel of the relationship between British imperialism and Zionism, the defence and the permanent security of the approaches to the Suez Canal. Our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom said the other day that in 1947, they relinquished the Mandate because they found it «unworkable in practice» and «irreconcilable». It is not the impracticability of the Mandate and the obligations of the Mandatory Power. You saw at that time that the lines of communication were no longer the imperial lines of communication.

The Suez Canal belongs no longer to the British Empire; the Suez Canal belongs to its people, to the Arab people, at present to the people of the United Arab Republic. Seeing how things have changed, you relinquished your authority under the Mandate. Because you were there, you brought Zionism into the area for the permanent security of your lines of communication and security of the Suez Canal, the Suez Canal becoming the possession of its people. You relinquished the Mandate. It is not a question of impracticability and irreconcilability; it is the irreconcilability of your interests, not the obligations under the Charter.

As representative of the United Kingdom, I thought our distinguished colleague — the representative of the United Kingdom — would know the record of the British Government on this question. Has he ever read Mr. Palmerston's instructions to British representatives in the East between 1839 and 1841, when it was made clear that the Jews in Palestine should be encouraged to look to Great Britain for protection? In those days the British Government examined a scheme for the settlement of the Jews on the threshold of Palestine, in the Sinai Peninsula.

Again, on Chamberlain's initiative, the Zionists were offered Cyprus and, as second best, a tract of land in the then British East Africa Protectorate. Some twenty years later, a plan backed by Disraeli and Salisbury was proposed for the settlement of the Jews on a vast tract of land east of the Jordan.

This is the record of the British Empire on this question and the instructions of Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Great Britain on this question.

What did Mr. Amery, a leading and distinguished English statesman, write? This is what he said:

> «... from the purely British point of view, a prosperous Jewish population in Palestine, owing its inception and its opportunity of development to British policy, might be an invaluable asset as a defence of the Suez Canal against attack from the North and as a station on the future air routes to the East.»

This is Mr. Amery — this is not an Arab source — speaking of the combined interests that link Zionism with British imperialism.

Again, I have here before me another memorandum of 1916, bearing the title «Memorandum of Policy», written by a leading Englishman which says:

> «British and Jewish interests coincide ... This harmony between the right of the oldest claimants to Palestine and the imperial interests of Great Britain imposes upon both the duty of framing a scheme where both claims can be brought into unison.»»

Once again, let me quote Mr. Lloyd George, who, speaking of those relations, said:

> «It was believed ... that such a Declaration» — referring to the Balfour Declaration — «would have a potent influence upon world Jewry outside Russia and secure for the entente the aid of Jewish financial interests. In America their aid would have a special value when the Allies had almost exhausted the gold and marketable securities available for American purchases.»

Looking for gold and securities in the markets of the United States.

I think it would have been more worthy for the representative of the United Kingdom, before volunteering such a statement, to read the record, the record, not only of British statesmen, but also the record of Zionist leaders themselves who have made London their headquarters. The Zionists finally chose London as the headquarters of the Zionist Movement.

In 1900, the Zionist leader, Mr. Herzl, in opening the Congress in London said the following in German:

> «England das grosse, England das freie, das liber alle Meore blickat, wird uns und unsere Bestrebungen verstehen.»

Translated into English, this means:

> «England, with her eyes roaming over all the seas, will understand us

and our aims.»

This is the Zionist position with regard to this question.

But let us leave the authorities aside, let us leave statements aside, let us take the actual reality by itself. Just as colonial capitalism has played its part in Africa — and here I invite the attention of our distinguished colleague from Liberia; I am happy to see him seated now — so, too, the activities of the Zionists with regard to capitalism and the formation of companies in London, registered as British companies, in the same manner as many European companies have been registered in Europe with wide activities in Africa — foreign capital, foreign exploitation — just as colonial capitalism has played its part in Africa, Zionist capitalism in Palestine, with its headquarters in London, spared no efforts to support alien immigration and the establishment of a «Jewish National Home».

The Jewish National Trust was incorporated in 1899 as a British company in London, the Jewish National Fund was incorporated in England in 1917 as a British company, the Anglo-Palestine Company in 1903 and the Palestine Land Development Company in 1909 — all these were registered in London as British companies with activities in Palestine. What more is required to prove the alliance between British imperialism and the activities of Zionism?

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom has spoken at great length with regard to the principles of self-determination, he has spoken of the irreconcilability of the obligations of Great Britain under the Mandate. It took Great Britain twenty-five years to find out that its obligations under the Mandate are irreconcilable, that they are contradictory, that they are unworkable and inapplicable; but long before, leading British statesmen knew — from the very start, from the very genesis — that those obligations of the United Kingdom were irreconcilable.

And here Mr. Lloyd-George, a great statesman — I have his statement before me — said:

> «What I have never been able to understand is how it (the Balfour Declaration) can be harmonized with the ... Covenant (of the League of Nations...»

Mr. Lloyd-George says unequivocally that he cannot understand how the Balfour Declaration can be harmonized with the Convenant of the League of Nations.

Again, Lord Balfour, the author of the Balfour Declaration, made this statement which goes down in history as a most revealing statement:

> «I agreed to the creed of self-determination, but it could not be indiscriminately applied, and Palestine was a case in point.»

It is an exception, according to Mr. Balfour. He agrees with the principle of self-determination, but Palestine is an exception. Why should it be an exception? Why should it be the only exception? Palestine should be an exception to the principle of self-determination, according to the statement of Mr. Balfour. He went on to say:

«In Palestine we are dealing not with the wishes of an existing community, but are consciously seeking to reconstitute a new community (the Jewish community) and definitely building for a numerical majority in the future.»

Mr. Balfour says we are not seeking the right of the existing community, but we are seeking to build up numerically a Jewish majority in the country.

And now comes the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom to say it is unworkable, it is irreconcilable, when Mr. Balfour himself said we are not conscious of those people living in the area but we are building up a new majority, a Jewish majority.

And again, Mr. Balfour made a very amusing and exciting statement, in this connexion, when he was challenged with the right of the people of Palestine, Lord Balfour said:

> «Zionism, be it right or wrong, be it bad or good ... is of far profounder importance than the desire of the 700,000 Arabs who inhabit that ancient land.»

Mr. Balfour speaks in unequivocal terms .. «Zionism, ... be it bad or good...» it makes no difference — I do not care about the desire of the 700,000 thousand people who now reside and inhabit that ancient land.

What right, what justice, what equity is there in the Balfour Declaration when the very author of the Declaration says that Zionism, be it bad or good, be it just or unjust, I do not care, neither do I care for the desire of the 700,000 people who reside in the country.

Now, Gentlemen, we are the offspring of the 700,000 people who were ignored by Lord Balfour and the United Kingdom, without the knowledge, probably, of our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom.

The 700,000 residents of Palestine, of that ancient land, are the people of the land since time immemorial, it is their ancestral home. And because the Balfour Declaration was based on these terms of Lord Balfour — be it bad or good, it is unimportant, it is insignificant, these people, we can dispose of them since they are cattle, and that is the end of it. The tragedy now before you is an item on the United Nations agenda; we are the offspring of those 700,000 people who were ignored by the United Kingdom because of imperialism and Zionism linking their aims and ambitions together.

The record is very lengthy, indeed, and I would not go into the record at all — just one authority which I should like to quote to show that the present tragedy of the Palestine problem was quite well known to all the statesmen; they did not need a whole generation to find out that there is an injustice in this question, or that such objections are irreconcilable.

British statesmen are people of great talent; they have brilliant minds, they are quite intelligent and they know the good and bad in all these movements. They knew from the very start that it was going to cause a refugee problem, that a refugee problem was in store for them.

I have here before me a portion from a pamphlet by the London Zionist Bureau, early in 1919. The Zionist pamphlet declared as follows — I call the attention of the United States delegation, and the attention of the United Kingdom delegation to this portion of the report of the Zionist Bureau in London.

> «Democracy in America too commonly means majority rule... if the crude arithmetical conception of democracy were to be applied now, or at an early stage in the future, on the Palestine conditions, the majority which would rule would be the Arab majority.»

This is the Zionist calculation, this is the Zionist proportion; if the rule of the majority is to prevail, the Zionists say in their pamphlet, that the country will have to be governed by an Arab majority.

«No Jew doubts the sincerity with which America would assume the trusteeship over a Jewish Palestine, but the dangers here indicated are dangers inherent in American conditions.»

In America it is the rule of the majority, therefore, the Zionists would not want an American trusteeship, they want a British trusteeship because the British are too tactful and they can bring about a Jewish majority, or a policy which will expell the people from their country and allow Jewish migration to flow and flow, until the Jews can get hold of the country.

The United Nations Committee on Palestine — which is a United Nations organ — made, and rightly so, in 1947 the following verdict — and it shows that the whole thing was void as an issue; the Balfour Declaration was void as an issue, the Jewish National Home was void as an issue, and the mandate over Palestine was void as an issue. This is the verdict of the United Nations Committee;

> «The principle of self-determination was not applied to Palestine. Actually, it may be said that the Jewish national home and the mandate for Palestine run counter to that principle.»

This is the verdict of the United Nations, that the principle of self-determination was not applied to the case. It was remarked by our distinguish-

ed colleague of New Zealand, the other day, that the minority in Palestine, the Arabs in Palestine are enjoying full citizenship and equal rights with the other sectors of people. I do not want to go into the details of this question, I simply regret that our distinguished colleague from New Zealand volunteered a statement without studying the question, I regret that his generation, as he said, during the First World War had their garrison headquarters in the Arab world and, as he said, in the shade of the pyramids — no other day will come when foreign troops will be on Arab land. But I regret that the man of this generation should not know better on this question. The Arab minority now, the very idea of the Arab minority is a persecution in itself.

When you live as a part of the majority in your homeland and you are reduced to a minority, this is persecution in itself. These people have been living with their fathers, sons and grandsons, as a majority in their homeland. Now they have been reduced to a minority; they had been living as a majority of 93 per cent of the land and after twenty-five years they find themselves a fraction, and a fraction of a fraction. This is persecution in itself, to be a minority, to be reduced to the status of a minority.

If the people of the United States became reduced to a minority in their homeland because a wave, of a Chinese conquest, or a Japanese conquest, or a Canadian conquest, if they become a minority, this in itself would be persecution.

I do not want to go into the entire record of this question, but let me read to you, my distinguished colleague from New Zealand, for you to learn and study before you come to the Committee and volunteer a statement.

This is a brief cablegram which was sent by the head of an Arab village, which you described as a minority, and this is the cable which was sent to the President of Israel:

> «On August 11, 1953, the Jewish settlers dynamited our homes after the destruction of thousands of our fruit-bearing trees. Israel authorities made the aggressors enter our lands and helped them. Eight years old, I have never heard of, nor seen a more despotic and oppressive people, than you. Pay the value of my properties so that I may leave, or kill me so that I may enjoy rest. I complain to God against you. Kill us; we hate life under your oppressive yoke. Are we in a state or among a gang?»

This is the cable addressed to the President of Israel by the head of an Arab village, which you described as an Arab minority, questioning the President of Israel «Are we living among a gang, with gansters» — or «Is this a state».

You should better read the records before you speak.

In her statement before the Committee the other day, Mrs. Gold Meir referred to Zionism as a liberation movement, stressing that amongst the ob-

jectives of Zionism, after the redemption of Israel, is the redemption of Africa, with a special emphasis on slave trade.

It is not my intention to speak on the question of the obligations of Israel with regard to the redemption of Africa — I leave it four our colleagues from Africa to respond, whether they accept as an obligation of Israel, the redemption and liberation of Africa through Israel. This is not my concern. But that portion with regard to the emphasis on slave trade was very exciting and, in fact, it did excite me to learn — we must come here with an open mind, open to learn and willing to learn, with objectivity — and because of that, I have gone myself to the Fifth Avenue Library to learn. I went to the second floor, right into the Jewish section and I looked into the Jewish Encyclopaedia.

I found, in Volume 9, on page 565, in the Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia — and mind you, I went to the Jewish section, and I put my hand on the Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia. This is not an Arab source at all, nor a Press clipping. This is the Jewish Encyclopaedia, and it says :

> «It was natural that Jews have participated in slavery trades, to which they were especially adapted, in view of their knowledge of languages and their connections throughout the world. Jewish slave-traders appear as early as the first century of the Christian era in Europe. They were particularly active after the sixth century».

Then I moved to another source — again, a Jewish Encyclopaedia. This is not the Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia; this is another encyclopaedia called just «Jewish Encyclopaedia»... In volume 2, page 409, it says :

> «At the sixth century Jews had become the chief traders of slaves, British slaves who had been brought to the Roman market were in the hands of Jewish slave-traders. In the ninth century, Jewish slave-traders carried slaves from the West to the East and from the East to the West, Many of the Spanish Jews owed their wealth to the trade in slaves».

And, again, I went to another source. This time it was the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, volume 14, on page 78, where I read :

> «For generations the export of Slavonic people (slave trade) was carried by Jewish merchants».

I hope on no other occasion Mrs. Meir will speak of the liberation and emancipation of Africa, because we have the Jewish Encyclopaedia available to refute the falsehoods of Mrs. Golda Meir in speaking about Zionism as a liberation movement and Israel as being the redeemer of Africa. Here is your record. Go and read it before speaking on this question.

Mrs. Meir referred the United Nations to the archaeology in Palestine. She told us that archaeologists from many countries «are digging up the past in our country and conforming the scriptural account of the Hebrew civilization

in the land». This is a very amusing argument, based on archaeology. I know of no place in the world where there is archaeology for one nation or another. Palestine has no monopoly on the archaeology of the Hebrews. There one has the archaeology of the Assyrians, of the Babylonians, of the Egyptians, of the Seljukian Turks, the Ottoman Turks, and of the Persians — of all peoples of all races. It so happens that Palestine is at the crossroads, so we have there archaeology from many different nations. If we are to base our status here on archaeology and archaeologists, I think the United Nations would be a congregration not of diplomats but of archaeologists. And I wonder if then Mrs. Meir would appear representing Israel as an archaeologist.

On the question of Hebrew civilization : no one denies that there was a Hebrew nation in Palestine. There has been a Hebrew civilization there; there was an Assyrian civilization, a Roman civilization, a Greek civilization. Well, I have not heard from any people in Greece or Italy that they have a historic right in Palestine because of the Roman civilization or the Greek civilization in Palestine. If we are to follow these civilizations, and undertake a resurrection, a reconstruction, of the United Nations, you would find yourselves without credentials except archaeology and stones. You would not receive them from Governments, but you would receive your credentials from archaeologists. This is simply ridiculous — to base yourself on archaeology and civilizations. I should like to remind everybody here in the Committee that it is not a question of archaeology for the people. We have living museums in Spain, well guarded and protected by our distinguished friends, whom we hail here and praise — the people of Spain. For 800 years the Arabs were there building a civilization and we still have the greatest monuments, not of archaeology, not underground, but above ground, living there with all dignity and being protected by the great scientists of Spain and by the great scholars of Spain, because they know what civilization means. It is universal. It was Arab in origin but now it stands as a universal civilization and the Spaniards are taking the best of care of those mosques and those places. But no one claims that we have any historic association with Spain because of archaeology or because of civilization. This is fantastic. It must be ruled out, thrown out, of the United Nations. This is no argument at all.

Mrs. Meir said that the Bible is a better source of information and that we should go back to the Bible for our information. Well, I do concede that the Bible has a great deal of information on the history of Palestine. The record in the Bible is one of invasion of all tribes — the Amorites, the Jebusites, the Hebrews, the Canaanites — all tribes were warring with each other. That is the history in the Bible. If we are to go to the Bible, we must seek the authority of people who know the Bible. Mrs. Meir does not know the Bible. She is not Rabbi Mrs. Meir. She is Mrs. Meir, and that is all. Let us go to the Rabbis and see what they say about the Bible. Well, the Rabbis, writing in a leading English review in 1878, say the following — and this has been quoted by our distinguished colleague from Syria :

«Ever since the conquest of Palestine by the Romans we have ceased to be a body politic. We are citizens of the country in which we dwell. We are simply Englishmen or Frenchmen or Germans, as the case may be.»

This is the pronouncement of a Rabbi, who knows the Bible better than Mrs. Meir. We have also the pronouncement of the Rabbis in 1885, a group of the most distinguished Rabbis of the day, meeting in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which is as follows :

«We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community and therefore expect no return to Palestine».

This is the verdict of the Rabbis meeting in congregation and saying that they have ceased to be a nation, and expect no return to Palestine. If the Bible has better information, you must abide by the pronouncement of those who know the Bible, and those who know the Bible are the Rabbis. Unless Mrs. Golda Meir comes here at the next session and presents herself as a Rabbi Mrs. Golda Meir, and we are prepared to accept her in that capacity.

Again, Rabbi Phillip Sigal spoke as follows :

«A Jewish 'nation' never existed because for Jews, biological descent, territory, language, history, political organization or any other commonly accepted charcteristic of nationalism, never held any significance».

This is the verdict of a Rabbi — that you are not a nation, not a people, not a race. You have no political entity. It is simply a faith, simply a fraternity, simply a religious association.

I have given you the views of the Rabbi in the United Kingdom, the Rabbi in the United States, and here are the views of people in the Soviet Union. In a letter written by Mr. Gunzburg, and this is what was said by Baron Gunzburg:

«.... took the view that, after the Revolution, 'we have become simply Russians who go to Synagogue'.»

So — in the Soviet Union they are simply Russians who go to the synagogue and in the United States they are Americans who go to the synagogue. In the United Kingdom they are simply Jews who go to the synagogue in the United Kingdom. They are not a nation, not a race, not a people. You rest on the Bible.

This is the authority of the people who know the Bible better than you do. Do not ask the Bible to be your final authority, your final judge. You should be judged by the Bible, and this is the verdict of the Bible.

But if you do not like theology, let us turn to science. What is the verdict of science, pure science ? Here is a recent study of the Jewish people — a biological history by UNESCO in 1960: this is a publication made under the auspices of UNESCO, and UNESCO is the greatest posession of the United Nations and the final word for science and for culture and for education. What

is the judgement of UNESCO in this case — and by a Jewish pen, Professor Harry Shapiro. A professor, himelf a Jewish professor, he speaks in the following terms, and he is the chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History. He portrayed the Jews as :

«... not a clan, a tribe, or in a strict sense, a nation».

So if you want theology, there is the verdict of the Rabbis; if you want science, this is the view of UNESCO, the author a Jewish scholar speaking of you not being a tribe, not a clan and not a nation. And so, upon what are you basing yourself, what is your entity, here ? This is a moment for me to ask, and I am sorry to tax your patience. This is a problem which has been with us for the last fifteen years, living here for the last fifteen years, but for the people living in tents, in camps, in distress and affliction, and it is for this reason that I think it is my duty to place everything before you, before your conscience, so that you know all the facts. This case has been living in darkness, in distortion — Zionist distortion. Some representatives do not read when they come here to the United Nations, they do not even read the records of their Governments, they do not know the policies of their Governments. They just take things offhand, out of their sleeves. That is why it is my duty to call their attention to their records.

I called the United States attention to the record of the United States, and the United Kingdom to the record of Great Britain, and Israel to the record of the Bible, either in theology or in the scientific way, as I have shown. That is why it is my duty to put the whole case before you, Mr. Chairman. I see now that it is ten minutes after one. I am at your disposal. I still have many things to say, not because we want to speak but because the question is so comprehensive, so wide, that we should state the case from all its angles, in our concluding statement. I am at your disposal. If you want me to continue, I am quite ready, if you want me to resume at another meeting, I am quite ready.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : In view of the lateness of the hour, I propose to adjourn this meeting and we shall go on this afternoon at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

THIRD STATEMENT

PART II

Made Before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly at its 413th meeting, held on 19 Novembor 1963, at 3 : 00 p. m.

(Source : U. N. Document A/SPC/PV. 413).

I admit that my statements have been lengthy, whether the first, the second, or this third, concluding, statement. I admit, too, that I was carried away with emotion, with passion and with sentiments, but I do not apologize, either for the length or for the passion of the statements which I make. I recall on so many occasions, when people come out of an opera house, seeing broad smiles on their faces, seeing them hilarious and clamorous, simply for the reason that they had seen a comedy in the opera house. Fictitious the comedy may have been, but, still, there were the broad smiles on the faces of the spectators on leaving the opera house. In the same way, we have often and on various occasions noted people coming out of an opera house with their eyes full of tears and the ladies' handkerchiefs wet with tears. Fictitious as the tragedy in the opera house may have been — it was not real, it was fictitious, the characters were not living and the story was simply fiction — yet, in spite of the lack of reality, we find people coming out with their eyes full of tears and with the ladies' handkerchiefs wet with tears. What would be your feelings if it was a real tragedy, and not fiction ? What would be your passions if the living characters in the tragedy were human beings, and not individuals but an entire nation ? For this reason, I do not apologize, either for the impassioned statement that I made this morning, or for the emotional statement which I might make this afternoon.

This is particularly so when the whole tragedy is still beclouded by heavy clouds of distortion. The other day we heard from Mrs. Golda Meir a very serious distortion with regard to the refugee question, and I read from her statement, when she used **The New York Times** as a source :

> «... the Arab League made public its programme for the occupation of Palestine by the armies of the League's member-States...»
>
> **(A/SPC/PV. 410, p. 12)**

The contention that seven Arab armies entered into Palestine with the

wilful purpose of defeating the resolution of the United Nations and destroying the very existence of Israel is a very serious charge to make here in the United Nations. One would expect, after the entry of seven Arab armies onto the soil of Palestine, the Security Council to say a word; one would expect the Security Council to pass a verdict; one would expect the Security Council to pass a resolution condemning the Arab States and condemning their armies for aggression; if it really was aggression.

We admit that the Arab armies entered Palestine, but on 14 May 1948, six months after the adoption of the resolution of 1947. Had the action of the Arab armies been one of aggression, had it been one in breach of the Charter, the Security Council would have spoken at least one word in condemnation. That action was taken by the Arab armies at the time that the Security Council was in session, was convening to examine the situation in Palestine. The unrest in Palestine had called for continuous and resumed sessions of the Security Council, and, in spite of the fact that it was seized with the action of the Arab armies, not a single resolution was passed condemning the Arab States for this action.

This is ample evidence in itself that it was not one of aggression, that it was not one of aggression, that it was not an unlawful or illegitimate intervention. The silence of the Security Council on this question is tantamount to support of the action taken by the Arab armies. It is tantamount to an endorsement of the intervention of the Arab armies as being lawful, legitimate, and legal. Is it conceivable that the Security Council — whose primary responsibility is to maintain international peace and security — would sit back in the Security Council lounge, witnessing the entry of seven Arab armies into Palestine, and not say a word, not make a condemnation? This was an implied recognition of the right of the seven Arab armies to take the action which they took.

If we must speak of condemnation, if we must refer to condemnation, let us refer to the series of condemnations passed by the Security Council, not against the Arab States, not against the Arab armies, but against Israel and Israeli action, Israeli massacres, Israeli manslaughter. It is on record that Israel was several times condemned because of lawless acts, because of acts of murder, because of acts of massacre, whereas not a single condemnation was passed against the Arabs by the Security Council.

Let me just say to you, gentlemen, that Israel was condemned by the sessions of the Security Council on 24 November 1953 in the most solemn and condemnatory words because of the massacre of a whole village, Qibya village, on the Jordanian side, where innocent, defenceless, helpless people were murdered in daylight, with no provocation — the whole village was destroyed. The Security Council condemned Israel for that uncivilized, most brutal and savage attack against a defenceless village, while there is no condemnation of the

Arabs by the Security Council, whether for the destruction of a village or for an attack against an Israeli soldier ?

On 28 March 1955, we had another condemnation by the Security Council with regard to an unlawful attack, an act of murder, a wholesale act of destruction against the people of Gaza. And who are the people of Gaza? A congregation of refugees. You have 350,000 refugees in the Gaza Strip, and Israel regarded it as an act of war and within a code or morality to bombard a place where there are refugees and camps of refugees? People are being deprived of their homeland, defenceless and harmless people, and still Israel would find it convenient to bombard such an area and thus incur the condemnation of the Security Council. That is the second condemnation by the Security Council.

Well, the third condemnation is one dated 19 January 1956 in connexion with the attack on the military encampments in Syria on the eastern shore of Lake Tiberias. That was an attack, a military raid, with no justification, with no provocation whatsoever, wilfully carried out at night — it was not during the day — clandestinely done in the darkness. The Security Council condemned that action in the most condemnatory phrases. At that time when the question was under consideration in the Security Council I appeared before it as Chairman of the Syrian delegation. This is the third condemnation by the Security Council.

There were two other condemnations by the Security Council, the most recent being for the tripartite aggression against Sinai and the forces of Egypt.

But let me ask, which of the Member States represented here around this table in this honoruable Committee was condemned even once by the Security Council?

The other day Mrs. Meir put this question to the representatives assembled around this table: Who of the States here represented around this table would allow the entry of people to their land without permission? Well, the answer is quite simple: Which of the States represented here in this Committee has been condemned by the Security Council five consecutive times within a period of four years? I know of no Member State which has gained these five medals, condemnation medals from the Security Council against Israel, whose representative is seated at the other end of the table. And they speak of peace, they speak of negotiations, and they speak of their clean record.

This morning, our distinguished colleague from Liberia spoke of persons who must come with clean hands to the United Nations. He who seeks equity, he reminded us, must come with clean hands. Where are the clean hands of Israel? Hands full of bombs, hands which are tarnished with the condemnations of the Security Council. Well, my distinguished colleague of Liberia, I

would like to follow your dictum: He who seeks equity must come with clean hands. Israel is seeking negotiation. Does it come to the United Nations with clean hands? Could the hands of Israel be clean when it has been condemned five consecutive times with the condemnation of the Security Council? Far from it.

Mrs. Meir quoted **The New York Times** with regard to the entry of the seven Arab armies into Palestine. Why should **The New York Times** be quoted in this matter? Why should a journal, a neswpaper, be quoted on this matter? I will make no reflection against **The New York Times,** its position, its general views on the question of Palestine or its reaction with regard to the refugees. I will not make any reflection with regard to the entire blackout which United States newspapers have placed on this item. So far, we have been discussing this item for three weeks and I have not been able to trace three lines in United States newspapers on this question — a total blackout, a total curfew. And still we claim there is freedom of Press here, freedom of information. There is freedom of suppression of information. This is the freedom we see here.

But why should we invoke **The New York Times** in this question? We have the records of the Security Council, we have United Nations documents; they should be our primary source of evidence. You do not go to **The New York Times** unless the records of the United Nations are not available; but the records of the United Nations, the records of the Security Council, are very clear.

I should like to refer to Security Council document S/745. This is a United Nations document, and if Israel is really serious and wants to bring the truth and facts as they are before the Committee it must invoke United Nations documents, and particularly Security Council documents. On 14 May 1948 when the Security Council convened it received a communication from the Secretary-General of the Arab League and that communication has become a United Nations document. What does that document say with regard to the entry of the seven Arab armies into the territory of Palestine? This is what the Arab League said: «The Mandatory» — this reference is to the British Mandatory, and I hope this will not offend our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom, who, a minute ago, came to me and introduced himself in a very pleasant way, as the British do — they are quite gentle off the record —

> «The Mandatory has already announced that on the termination of the Mandate it will no longer be responsible for the maintenance of law and order in Palestine except ...
>
> «This leaves Palestine absolutely without any administrative authority entitled to maintain, and capable of maintaining, a machinery of administration of the country adequate for the purpose of ensuring due protection of life and property ...

> «The recent disturbances in Palestine further constitute a serious and direct threat to peace and security within the territories of the Arab States themselves. For these reasons» — and here I invite your attention — » ... and in order to fill the vacuum created by the termination of the Mandate and the failure to replace it by any legally constituted authority, the Arab Governments find themselves compelled to intervene for the sole purpose of restoring peace and security and establishing law and order in Palestine.»

These are the reasons submitted by the Arab League to the Security Council.

The Security Council received this communication from the Arab League and it convened to examine the situation, a most disturbing situation in the Middle East, with regard to outbreaks in Palestine. The Security Council was seized of this document, the pronouncements of the Arab League. But what did the Security Council do? Did it act? Did it pass any resolution, any condemnation, adjudication? It let things go, and the document went into the official records of the Security Council. It became part of the record of the proceedings of the Security Council, with no action taken by the Security Council.

If that means anything — and it is meaningful — it means simply that the Arab armies had lawfully entered into Palestine for the sole purpose, as the communication states, of restoring law and order, for the sole purpose of filling the vacuum which was created by the relinquishment of the British Government, for the sole purpose of establishing law and order and keeping human life and property from destruction.

Let me assure you, Gentlemen, particularly those States whose citizens go every Christmas and every Easter to the Holy Land to say their prayers, were it not for the intervention of the seven Arab armies, your citizens who go, on an occasional Christmas or Easter, to Palestine would not have found the Church of the Holy Sepulchre intact, and would not have found the Church of the Nativity intact, neither would it have found the holy shrines and the sacred establishments of Nazareth intact; they would have been destroyed during the Israeli murders by the destructive forces of the Israelis and during the Israeli terrorism that was going on as a calculated, preconceived campaign, a policy of murder, of terror, of fire, of destruction. You would not have found those Churches to which your citizens go intact, you would have found them destroyed, a heap of debris. The Christian world is indebted to the seven Arab armies, which kept those holy shrines and sacred places now intact so that the Christian world may go there and pray, with free access, as a holy pilgrimage to those places.

You should know that as a fact.

Why did the Arab armies enter Palestine ? Why, Was it for fun ? Was it for pleasure? Was it a military parade ?There must have been a reason for

it. What was the background? Let us consult the record. I submit that the Israelis started what I would call a Seven-Years-War. Less in magnitude than the European Seven-Years-War, but, in fact, it was a Seven-Years-War, one of terror and destruction, waged in the Holy Land against the defenceless people of the country. We have it on record that Mr. Ben-Gurion, in 1940 ... —and you should remember this date, because that makes up the Seven-Years-War. The British Government, as you have been told by the United Kingdom delegation, issued a White Paper in 1939, where in it ruled that there should not be a Jewish State in Palestine. The idea of a Jewish State was ruled out in the White Paper and the Israelis, under the leadership of Mr. Ben-Gurion, and the Jewish Agency, declared war, so that they established the Jewish State. We have here a declaration, a declaration of war by Mr. Ben-Gurion, in unequivocal terms, not in a figurative sense, not in a metaphorical sense, but in the actual terms of a declaration of war. Mr. Ben-Gurion said: «we shall fight the White Paper, as if there was no war.»

The United Kingdom, at that time, was engaged in a war against the Nazis, and the Allied Nations were also engaged in that war against the Nazis, but, in spite of the war effort of the Allied Nations against the Nazis, still Mr. Ben-Gurion found it fitting and convenient to declare war against the White Paper, as if there had been no war.

Here is an official communiqué: this is another authority dated 10 October 1944. The British Commander-in-Chief in the Middle East declared that the Jewish terrorists and their active and tacit supporters were directly impeding the war effort of Great Britain and assisting the enemy.

Who was the enemy in that war? The Nazis. The Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in the Middle East, in that declaration said that: «Jewish terrorists and their active and passive supporters are directly impeding the war effort of Great Britain and assisting the enemy». In spite of that they continued a war of terror, bloodshed and destruction in the Holy Land. That was in 1944.

Let us move now to 1946. What was the situation in 1946? We know, and our colleagues from the United States and the United Kingdom know, that there had been an Anglo-American Commission visiting Palestine at that time to examine the situation, to see what were the reasons behind the Israeli terrorism, behind the Israeli war, this campaign of destruction that was waged against the people and against the country. The Anglo-American Commission convened in Jerusalem and convened many sessions in various parts of the country. I cannot read the whole report, although it is a valuable report, rich with information; but I shall only put before you the titles of the report of the Anglo-American Commission. This is not a Soviet Union Commission which you can consider so easily as being from the Eastern bloc: I hear it sometimes said, well, this is an Eastern-bloc communication or information, or argumentation, if you please; that is sufficient, by itself, to destroy the vera-

city of the argument, which is a heap of nonsense. Well, this is an Anglo-American Commission which visited the country. Let me read you only the titles; I will not go into the events, because they are hair-raising, they are terrifying, they are heartbreaking. Only the titles would be sufficient to tell you what terrorism the Israelis were waging against the people and against the Holy Land.

The Anglo-American Commission has narrated all these shocking incidents in the most graphic terms. I shall not read the details ; permit me only to read the titles of some of the acts committed by the Jewish forces in Palestine from 1940-1946, when the Committee was examining the situation in Palestine. Here are the titles, Mr. Chairman, here are the titles, distinguished delegates:

> «Tampering with St. George's Cathedral in Jerusalem», «An attempt to assassinate the High Commissioner», «Attacking the Department of Immigration of Palestine», «Bombing police headquarters», «Destroying income tax offices», «British policemen murdered», «Broadcasting station attack», «Government offices bombed», «Attempted murder of the High Commissioner and his wife», «Police buildings attacked», «Lord Moyne, British Minister of State in the Middle East, assassinated in Cairo», «Palestine railway attacked», «British soldiers murdered in cold blood», «Officers kidnapped», «King David Hotel bombed, with ninety killed and scores injured», «Bombing of police trolley», «Mass killings by explosives in Haifa», «Abduction of a judge from the Court», — abduction of a judge who is supposed to have immunity all over the world, universal immunity, a judge being abducted from the bench, and again: «Derailment of trains», «Attack on Arab towns and villages», «Explosive letters» — and here, I call your attention to this — «Explosive letters to Mr. Churchill, Mr. Atlee, Mr. Bevin and Mr. Hebert Morrison and other British leaders». — Explosive letters sent in envelopes to these distinguished British statesmen so that when they opened them they would explode.

You say, why have the Arab States entered Palestine? Well, even one year before the emergence of Israel as a so-called State, many things were being done there, plans were being perpetrated here in the United States, and I wonder how the law-makers in the United States, how the judges, how the responsible authorities could allow such crimes to take place here in the United States under the eyes of the United States Attorney-General or Public Prosecutor, as you may please.

On 14 May 1947, in the **New York Post** — this is a newspaper here in the United States — the «Palestine Resistance Fund» — this is the name of a Jewish organization, or Israeli Organization — this Organization published advertisement, in the **New York Post,** here in the United States, to say the following:

«Every time you wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky high, or rob a British bank or let go with your guns and bombs at the British, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts.»

You see what are the holidays in the United States here? That is why we do not see so many holidays, nowadays, because there are no bombs against British banks. Well we would like to see some holidays, so that our distinguished colleague would send me something off the record, our distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom will come and tell me something off the record on that occasion.

This is another authority; we do not speak out of our sleeves. We have authoritative records here, which in July 1947, the British Mandatory Power submitted to the United Nations.

This is a document in the records of the United Nations, a memorandum in which the responsibility for the war in Palestine was laid directly on the shoulders of the Jewish community in Palestine. The memorandum said :

«Since the beginning of 1945 the Jewish community has implicitly claimed this right of political terrorism and has been supported by an organized commission of lawlessness, murder and sabotage, their contention being that whatever other interests might be served, nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of a Jewish State and Jewish immigration into Palestine.»

This is a United Nations document, by the British Mandatory Power, which says that the Jews have claimed for themselves the right to war, the right to terrorism, and that nothing should stand in the way of the establishment of a Jewish State. And Mrs. Meir comes here to ask why the Arab armies entered Palestine. You claim for yourselves the right to terrorism, the right to kill people — infants and old people — to destroy buildings and to send explosive letters to the British Ministers in London, and you would not allow the Arab armies to go in and fill the vacuum which was created by the termination of the Mandate, and to restore law and order? This is simply ridiculous.

We also have it on record from an Israeli source, this time, not from the British Mandatory, but from the Haganah, which is the army of Israel — the army before the emergence of Israel and the army after the emergence of Israel. The Haganah demanded the establishment of a Jewish State without regard to Arab existence, in a memorandum submitted by the Haganah to the United Nations Committee, this time. This is a memorandum from the Haganah to the United Nations Committee, in which it is declared that

« ... there is no doubt that the Jewish force is superior, in organization, training, planning and equipment. If you accept the Zionist solution for a Jewish State but are unable or are unwilling to enforce it, please do not interfere and we ourselves will ensure its implementation.»

This is the language of war, and it is addressed to the United Nations. And Mrs. Meir comes here to say that the Arab armies entered Palestine, that they caused the refugee problem. You kill people, attack their villages — open defenceless villages — drive their inhabitants out of the country, and when the Arab armies go into Palestine six months after the adoption of the resolution by the General Assembly in 1947, you come here and say that they are the cause of the whole tragedy. What were you doing with your bombs, your guns, your firearms, your destruction? You are the real cause and author of the whole tragedy.

It was a calculated massacre, entirely, from beginning to end. It was a policy of Israel, a calculated massacre of the people. You know that the Jewish State was established on the assumption that there were 450,000 Jews and 450,000 Arabs. Well, such a State is a Jewish State by title, by name, but it was in fact a bi-national State. Well, what should the Jews do in order to make it a Jewish State? They must completely destroy the 450,000 Arabs, by calculated massacre, and «calculated massacre» is not my term, it is the term of the Israelis, and I have here a revealing document which shows that Israel made this «calculated massacre» a part and parcel of its policy.

In the book entitled «A Soldier with the Arabs», on page 81, we find this very interesting story — very interesting, indeed, and very tragic at the same time.

> «In December 1947 a senior British officer in the Arab Legion was one day visiting a British District Commissioner in Palestine. A Jewish district officer, employed under the District Commissioner, was also present.»

And so here we have the characters in this story : one British District Commissioner, one British district officer, and then we have a district officer who is a Jew. They are at a cocktail party. Let us see who develops at this cocktail party. What was the result of the discussion ? They were having drinks in the evening. That is why I said it was a cocktail party. The United Nations Partition Plan had recently been published. The British officer asked the Jewish official whether the new Jewish State would not have some internal troubles, in view of the fact that the number of Arab inhabitants of the Jewish State would equal the number of Jews. That was a very intelligent question. The British officer asked the Jewish officer, «Now, what about the Arabs in Palestine ? How are you going to deal with them ?» That was the tremendous problem. And let us remember that the Zionist leader, Mr. Zacker, in 1917, wrote that to Dr. Weizmann, telling him «Even if all our schemings come true, there will remain the Arab population as our tremendous problem».

That tremendous problem was demonstrated, fully, in 1947, when the Jewish State was faced with the existence of 450,000 Arabs in Palestine, within the so-called Jewish State, equal in number to the Jews. And the Jewish officer replied — the reply of the Jewish officer is most informative, and it is the clue to the whole question, it is the clue to the tragedy.

What did the Jewish officer say ? This is what he said : «Oh, no» — that was the first reaction of the Jewish officer with regard to the tremendous problem of the Arabs within the Jewish State, «Oh, no» replied the Jewish officer, «that will be fixed. A few calculated massacres will soon get rid of them». A few calculated massacres will soon get rid of them. The speaker was not a terrorist. He was a decent, civilized official, a Jewish officer, in the administration of the Mandatory Government of Palestine, and he said, «Oh, no, this is no problem. A few calculated massacres will get rid of them». And we know what those calculated massacres are. Allow me to give you just one illustration, one account, of those calculated massacres, to see why the people of Palestine were driven out, and thrown out, of their country, streaming as refugees into the adjacent countries. I ask you, in spite of the hair-raising account of this little story I have just told you, to lend me your ears a bit longer.

On 10 April 1948 — and this is a very important date, because 10 April 1948 is about two months before the entry of the Arab armies — the village of Deir Yassin in the suburbs of Jerusalem was attacked by the Zionists. The Jewish forces rounded up most of its 600 inhabitants, looted everything of value in the village, and next turned their attention to their human booty, slaughtering men, women and children without mercy. About 250 Arabs were butchered. Among these were 52 mothers with babies at their breasts, sixty other women and young girls, and twenty-five pregnant women, whose bodies were deliberately ripped open with violence. Little children were cut to pieces under the eyes of their mothers. About 150 mutilatd corpses of women and children were thrown down a well. Zionist troops prevented all access to the scene of the massacre and when M. Jacques Regner, a delegate of the International Red Cross, asked permission of the Jewish agency to make an inspection of the place, he was delayed a whole day in order to give the assassins time to clean up the frightful mess.

In relating the facts, M. Regner of the International Red Cross stated that the situation was simply horrible. Apart from the bodies which had been thrown down the well, other corpses were lying about among the ruins of the destroyed houses.

This is only one massacre of the «calculated massacres» which the Jewish officer referred to, in order to get rid of this tremendous problem of the Arabs within the Jewish State.

The massacre of Deir Yassin was the subject-matter of an examination by Professor Toynbee, the distinguished historian of our world, who in his book «A Study of History» states on this massacre of Deir Yassin as follows :

> «The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs that were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis»

by the Nazis — this is the comparison between Zionism and Nazism; this is a verdict passed by Toynbee, the distinguished historian; it goes down as part of the records of the history of the twentieth century, Zionism being equated with Nazism by Professor Toynbee,

> «were the massacre of men, women and children at Deir Yassin on the 9th of April 1948, ... The Arab blood on the 9th of April 1948 at Deir Yassin was on the head of the Irgun; the expulsions after the 15th of May 1948, were on the heads of all Israel».

This is the verdict of Professor Toynbee, the brilliant mind of the United Kingdom all over the world, and to my mind he is more valuable to the world than a congregation of Foreign Ministers of the United Kingdom.

Recently, in his debate with the Israeli Ambassador to Canada, held at McGill University, Hillel House, Montreal, on 31 January 1961, Professor Toynbee was again very vibrant in his condemnation of these terrorist acts and he said :

> «... What we hate in what the Germans did was that it was planned beforehand, carried out cold-bloodedly with tremendous cruelty and with a purpose. Now I am afraid that all points applied to the massacres which were done by certain Israel armed froces».

It might be said that we are not here to relay the viewpoints of historians: theymight be debatable, they might be arguable, and we know history is only a reflection of the differences of view of various people and of various tendencies. But the Deir Yassin massacre was taken up by an Israeli court. It was examined by an Israeli court. What was the verdict of the Israeli court with regard to the Deir Yassin massacre ? It has always been the habit and custom of the Israeli spokesmen — and Mrs. Meir is one of them — to acquit themselves from this Deir Yassin massacre by saying «it is bloody, it was committed by extremists». No, Sir, it was not committed by extremists. It was committed by Israel and by Israeli armed forces. And this is the verdict of the Israeli court, Israeli tribunal. There we have at most people who can speak the truth at least on one occasion or another. In humanity there are moments of sanity whether they be Israelis or otherwise. And this is the verdict of the Israeli court with regard to the Deir Yassin massacre, in proceedings instituted by Kauffman, an Israeli officer who conducted the massacre of Deir Yassin and had sued Israel for a pension. This is an officer, a military officer who took part in the Deir Yassin massacre, and he sued Israel for a pension. The court had gone into the proceedings so deeply and had come up with the following verdict : The court declared:

> «We have been convinced that the Deir Yassin operation was ordered by the Jewish Minister of War as an operation against the Arabs».

So, this massacre of Deir Yassin was not the culmination of extremists or dissi-

dents; it was on the orders of the Minister of War, the Jewish Minister of War, as an act against the Arabs. And this is the verdict of the Israeli tribunal to which I pay homage here. I extend my homage to the Israeli tribunal which is holding its meetings in my homeland, on our soil, but still they have said the truth, and it is my duty here to admit truth when it is true and to refute the falsehoods of Mrs. Meir when they are falsehoods.

Again, let us go into another incident to explain why the seven Arab armies entered Palestine on 14 May 1948. Notwithstanding a written agreement which was concluded between the two parties in the office of the British District Commissioner with regard to Jaffa, an agreement between the Arabs on one side and the Jews on the other side — an agreement : and you are seeking here by negotiation that the Arabs and the Israelis go into an agreement. Let us see what was the result of that agreement, a local agreement the inhabitants of Jaffa and the Israelis on the other side. They signed an agreement that Jaffa should be left an open city, not to be attacked. There was an agreement signed by both parties in the office of the District Commissioner. But in spite of that agreement in which Jaffa was declared an open city, no sooner had the British troops withdrawn, then the Israeli armies attacked.

John Kimche — and John Kimche after all is a very distinguished Jew; he is not a Zionist, he is a Jewish well-known author and scholar — in his book, John Kimche — and he was an eye witness; during the disturbances he was in Palestine amongst the troops within the lines, on this side and on the other side — in his book entitled «Seven Fallen Pillars» writes as follows:

> «The bombardment was started with three-inch mortar which the Jews had captured a few weeks earlier in a raid on a British camp in which an officer and four soldiers had been killed. This bombardment started a panic among the Jaffa Arabs. The remaining 20,000 Arabs started to leave the city by boat and by road. ... A Jewish force commenced to loot in wholesale fashion. At first the young Irgunists pillaged only dresses, blouses and ornaments for their girl friends. But this discrimination was soon abandoned. Everything that was moveable was carried from Jaffa — furniture, carpets, pictures, crockery and pottery, jewelry and cutlery. The occupied parts of Jaffa were stripped, and yet another traditional military characteristic raised its ugly head. What could not be taken away was smashed. Windows, pianos, fittings and lamps went in ... destruction». This from John Kimche, a Jew, an eye-witness who witnessed the whole mess in Jaffa.

When I spoke the other day from the rostrum of the United Nations I said «even the spoons». Our spoons are being used by the Israelis in Palestine. Some of the representatives were similing; they thought I was using a metaphor. They thought it was a phrase used in a figurative sense. But you see here John Kimche telling you that carpets, blouses for girls, pottery and cutlery and everything was taken, robbed from Arab homes by those armies with the ethical

code of destruction, bloodshed and terrorism. And we are being questioned here as to why the Arab armies entered on 14 May 1948. This is the answer.

Again, let us go into Jaffa. I have a brief authority before me which states :

> «... The Jewish forces proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began fleeing in panic, shouting 'Deir Yassin'. Not one person of the 14,000 people was left in Safad in northern Palestine, six hours after the exodus commenced».

This is taken from the book entitled «The Revolt» by Menachem Bigin, the well-known terrorist, Irgunist among the Israelis. So in Haifa, the terrorists were going as a knife was going through butter : the victims, the Arabs were just the butter for the knife of the terrorists, so easy, so clean was the exodus of the people of Palestine.

We have also another authority, this time from the Haganah. In a leaflet dropped from the air in Northern Galilee, the Haganah commander declared on 16 May the following : This is the publication of the Regular Army of Israel — a leaflet dropped through the air, and it says :

> «Therefore, I declare in this communique that all people who do not want this war must leave together with their women and children in order to be safe. This war is going to be a cruel war with no mercy or compassion. There is no reason why you should endanger yourselves».

Again, in Jerusalem the Haganah loudspeaker burst out in Arabic, demanding that the citizenry leave the district before 5.15 p.m. of 15 May 1948 in the following terms :

> «Take pity on your wives and children and get out of this bloodbath. Get out by the Jericho Road while it is still open to you. If you stay, you invite disaster».

Well, this is an invitation for the refugees to get out; but if the Arab refugees, if the people of Palestine, extend an invitation to the Arab League to send in their armies to protect their lives it is a crime according to the code of Israel.

An American missionary, Miss Bertha Vester, who has spent her entire life in Jerusalem, reported in her book, «Our Jerusalem» — this is a distinguished lady; she is not partisan; she is not a party to the dispute; she has lived in Jerusalem as a peaceful citizen all her life — that Jewish chiefs were warning the inhabitants of Jerusalem and in the Arab villages by loudspeakers in these words : «Unless you leave your homes, the fate of Deir Yassin will be your fate». This is the call of the Israeli armed forces.

I have before me a testimony by a distinguished Jew, a Jew in Palestine, a resident of Israel and — if you please — a citizen of Israel. What actually

happened was disclosed by Nathan Chofshi, one of the original Jewish pioneers in Palestine. This is what he said :

> «... we old Jewish settlers in Palestine who witnessed the fight will tell how and in what manner we Jews forced the Arabs to leave cities and villages... Some of them were driven out by force of arms ; others were made to leave by deceit, lying and false promises. It is enough to cite the cities of Jaffa, Lydda, Ramle, Beersheba, Acre from among numberless others...» — from which the Arabs were driven out.

Again, Father Ralph Gorman, writing in **The Sign** — a United States national Catholic magazine, quite an independent magazine, with an objective outlook unlike many other newspapers which are not objective in outlook or tendencies — said : «The Nazis never used terror in a more cold-blooded way than the Israelis in the massacre of Qibya». This is Father Ralph Gorman writing in **The Sign,** a United States national Catholic magazine. I put my authority before the Israeli delegation to read and to refute, if it can reproduce it with veracity and without distortion.

Finally, let me come to a tabulation made by **The New York Times,** showing the towns and villages which were occupied by Israeli forces long before the Arab armies ever entered Palestine ; towns and villages, some of which fall within the Arab State as delineated by the Partition Plan.

It is not my intention now to tell you... You know our national aspirations and you know our stand. I am simply arguing within the limits of the General Assembly resolution, presenting a tabulation by **The New York Times** showing the villages and towns which were occupied by Israeli forces weeks and months before the Arab armies entered upon the soil of Palestine.

Here it is, taken from **The New York Times :**
Qazaza, occupied on 21 December 1947;
Sa'sa, on 16 February 1948;
Haifa, on 21 February 1948;
Salameh, on 1 March 1948;
Bir Adas, on 6 March 1948;
Kanna, on 13 March 1948;
Kastal, on 4 April 1948;
Deir Yassin, on 10 April 1948;
Lajjun, on 15 April 1948;
Saris, on 17 April 1948;
Tiberias, on 20 April 1948;
Haifa, on 22 April 1948;
Jerusalem, on 25 April 1948;
Jaffa, on 26 April 1948;
Acre, on 27 April 1948;
Jerusalem, again, other sectors, on 1 May 1948;

Safad, on 7 May 1948;
Beisan, on 9 May 1948.

All these towns and villages were occupied months and weeks before the entry of the Arab troops, and this is **The New York Times** compilation. It is not an Arab source.

We have yet another authoritative source. Falling from the lips of the United States delegation — and for a moment, in the whole United States record in dealing with the Palestine question, there was a sober mind, there was a moment of wisdom, and this is the authority I have before me in the form of a statement by the United States delegation to the Security Council, and this is what he said : — and that was prior to 14 May 1948 :

> « Since it had become clear that the Assembly resolution» — that is the 1947 resolution — «could not be implemented by peaceful means and that the Security Council would not be prepared to implement it, the Council should recommend a temporary trusteeship for Palestine under the Trusteeship Council».

This was one moment of wisdom and deliberation in the entire record of the United States in dealing with the Palestine question, when it told the Security Council that the United Nations resolution was not being implemented by peaceful means because it is being carried out by bloodshed and terror and destruction and fire committed by Israel long before 14 May 1948. For that reason, because the resolution could not be implemented by peaceful means, they asked the Security Council for a trusteeship for Palestine. It was being implemented by Israel through its armed forces.

But the Israeli armed forces had advanced and had addressed a communication to the Security Council telling them that: It is here that we will be able to deflect the Trusteeship Council. We reject it and our armed forces will defeat the trusteeship proposal, and we shall go ahead with the establishment of our State. And they went ahead, regardless of the representation of the representative of the United States at that time to the Security Council; and when they went ahead it was the duty of the seven Arab armies to enter Palestine to save what could be saved. They were able to save a few hundred thousand people who survive today. If today there are survivors of the Palestine people, it is because of the entry of the seven Arab armies. Were it not for their entry, a whole people would have been exterminated, and the whole land would be a debris of fire and a heap of destruction.

One of the most serious distortions that I have heard Mrs. Meir relate to the Committee here appears in her statement. She says, referring to paragraph 11 :

> «The paragraph does not speak of the refugees having a right» — and I stress the words «a right» — «to return, but only that they might be

'permitted' ... by Israel.» **(A/SPC/PV.410, p.21)**

On the same page, earlier, Mrs. Meir says: well, this is «one single paragraph of an old resolution».

This is really fantastic, it is really blasphemous and ridiculous. Where the rights of the refugees really appear in a paragraph, you do not need to have the rights of the refugees appear in a whole book or in a whole chapter, because the right of the refugees to go back to their homes is very simple, and it could be incorporated in one single paragraph. But to say that single paragraph appears in an old resolution is an insinuation that, because it is an old resolution, it no longer survives. Well, this is not a cemetery here at the United Nations; we do not have graveyards where we dig for old resolutions to bury them, and bury all the rights incorporated in those resolutions. If an old resolution is dead, there is an older resolution which must be dead; it is the resolution of 1947 which established Israel. If the rights of the refugees should be dead because the resolution was passed in 1948, then the very existence of Israel in 1947 — because it is an older resolution — must be dead, and Israel must quit the United Nations.

Well, this is the philosophy of Mrs. Meir, and I say it lacks philosophy; this is the logic of Mrs. Meir, and it is short of every logic.

Really it was amazing to go into a hair-splitting business with regard to that paragraph. Mrs. Meir was taking every word with a hair-splitting business, a hair-splitting interpretation. First of all, she said: There must be peace with Israel. Well, if you want to make a hair-splitting interpretation of the paragraph, let me say that the word «Israel» does not appear in operative pragraph 11. It states:

> «... refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date...»

There is no mention of the word «Israel» in the paragraph; if you want to make a hair-splitting interpretation, well let me ask you: Where is Israel in the paragraph? It does not figure in the paragraph; it does not exist. How can we import the idea of peace with Israel when Israel does not exist there. All that the paragraph says is: «... the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours...» and note «neighbour», underline «neighbour», emphasize «neighbour». The Arab refugees go to their homeland to live at peace with neighbours, but not with lords and masters. This is what operative paragraph 11 says, to live «with their neighbours», but not with masters or lords. Now Israel wants to establish itself as the lord and master of the refugees; this is not to be found in the connotation or interpretation of operative paragraph 11. And I think it would be more fitting for the Israeli now living in Israel to go back to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours in Germany, in France, in Argentina, or what-not, in various countries, in their former countries.

Well, this interpretation of Mrs. Meir does not hold water really — does not hold water at least in the light of transactions signed by Israel. Israel now comes here to deny the right of the refugees to repatriation. Well, the right of the refugees to repatriation is not one bestowed by the United Nations. We are on our right by our own right; it is God's given right, for those who believe in God, and natural right, for those who believe in nature. It is not bestowed by the United Nations. We are the people of Palestine, and Palestine is our homeland, whether you will or you will not. You have declared the right; you have recognized the right. You did not grant the right; nobody has granted you the right to your homeland. Nobody grants you the right to go back now to spend your Christmas in your home; it is your right.

So repatriation is simply declared by the United Nations. It is not the innovation of the United Nations; it is not the creation of the United Nations. It is our inherent, inalienable right, and we do not sit here to hear Mrs. Meir tell us that we should seek permission from Israel in order to go back to our homes. We have been existing in Palestine since before the existence of Israel. We were existing in our homeland before the very existence of Israel, generations before and for countless centuries. We have pre-existence, we have pre-existed the existence of Israel and the existence of Israel must be subordinated; and I am interpreting the United Nations resolution. I am stating my position, my national position. Israel must be subordinated to the rights and will of the people, because they pre-existed the existence of Israel for so many generations and for countless centuries.

I have here a document. I will tell you what it is later on. This is a document signed by Israel, by the accredited representative of Israel, and Israel has signed the following:

> «The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, anxious to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly resolution of 11 December 1948» — and I call your attention — «regarding refugees, the respect for their rights and the preservation of their property, as well as territorial and other questions, has proposed to the delegation of Israel and to the delegations of the Arab States that the working document attached hereto be taken as a basis for discussions with the Commission.
>
> The interested delegations have accepted this proposal with the understanding that the exchanges of views which will be carried on by the Commission with the two parties will bear upon the territorial adjustjustments necessary to the above indicated objectives.»

This is what is known as the Protocol of Lausanne, signed by Israel, by the duly accredited representative of Israel, admitting the rights of the refugees, admitting the right of the preservation of their properties, admitting that this is an objective for the discussions.

Israel accepted discussion with the United Nations Conciliation Commission to arrive at those above-mentioned objectives, namely, respect of the rights of the refugees and the preservation of their property. Now, this is the document signed by Israel; this is an admission of the right of the refugees to their property and to repatriation, and this is an objective to which the Conciliation Commission and the Israel delegation have given their assent by their signature. And here our distinguished colleague from Liberia this morning asks that we go ahead with negotiation. Well, how can you negotiate the question of the rights of the refugees? It has been admitted by Israel. Well, if it is admitted by Israel, you do not need to negotiate it. The rights of the refugees and the preservation of their property is an objective to which Israel has accorded its signature and its seal; it has accepted it with the Conciliation Commission and fourteen years later, because it is very convenient to Israel, one of our friends here comes to say: Well, why do you not negotiate the rights of the refugees? These rights, my dear friend, are inalienable rights. We cannot negotiate them. They have been accepted by Israel, and if Israel chooses now to deny the signature, if Israel chooses now to deny its position and to hold that the rights of the refugees are not rights, that we should seek the licence and pleasure of Israel, whether they should go back or otherwise — then we are being asked to go and negotiate on an area of denial and negation. It was accepted in 1949 under the auspices of the Conciliation Commission, and signed by the Israeli delegation at that time as a right and it was accepted that the properties of the refugees should be preserved. How can you negotiate that ?

The idea of negotiation means that it is not agreed upon, that it is debatable, that it is arguable, that is is questionable, that it is deniable. We will not accept negotiation on something which is not deniable or arguable or debatable. Our rights are not arguable ; they are not debatable. They have been accepted by the United Nations ever since 1948 and accepted by Israel on its own signature, and how can you come here and ask for negotiation? You negotiate with things which are debatable. You negotiate arguable matters; you negotiate disputable matters. But things which are accepted in principle — decisions of the United Nations — cannot be negotiable. Now, let me observe here and draw attention to the fact that the right of the refugees is affirmed in a United Nations resolution. That United Nations resolution has been reaffirmed for the last fifteen years. How on earth would you put the United Nations resolution as negotiable. The United Nations becomes a party, and its resolution becomes questionable. This is simply a mockery of the United Nations. You can negotiate any question, except when it was solved by the United Nations. When solved, that is the solution; you cannot negotiate. You negotiate things which have not been decided by the United Nations.

The United Nations, in attacking any problem, would ask the parties, first of all, to negotiate their differences. If they cannot, then they solve it by a decision. You have a decision here by the United Nations. You cannot

negotiate a decision of the United Nations. You would be making the whole of the United Nations a party to negotiation. But the United Nations is not a party. So how can you negotiate a decision? Problems which have not been resolved can be negotiated. But when a problem is resolved, it is resolved, that is all. It cannot be subject to negotiation. We would be making a mockery of the United Nations. Well, if it should be, let it not be by the delegations of the United Nations. Let someone else make a mockery of the United Nations outside the United Nations, not within this building, not a number or a group of delegations, asking for negotiation on a question which has already been resolved.

I want you to understand this point and ponder on it, meditate on it very profoundly and soberly, for the very dignity of the United Nations. It would be destroying the dignity of the United Nations. Once the United Nations has adopted a solution, it must be implemented. It cannot be negotiated.

Mrs. Meir has referred again to a colossal distortion, with regard to the properties of the refugees. Mrs. Meir has claimed that the properties of the refugees constitute 16.5 per cent of the land held under Israel. It is quite easy to just offer offhand figures, just as you please. Where did Mrs. Meir get these statistics ? How did Mrs. Meir reach the conclusion based on these figures, 16.5 per cent? Why not 15? Why not 17? Why not 20? Why not a zero? What is the basis for such calculation? How can she be bold enough to come here to the United Nations and claim that the Arabs own simply 16.5 per cent? Well, I have a little admission from Mr. Ben-Gurion, who is the leader of Mrs. Meir and was the Prime Minister of Israel for so many years, a very brief admission. When I speak, I bring my authority. When Mrs. Meir speaks, she brings no authority, simply a fallacy.

This is my authority: the United Nations, the United Nations books, the United Nations records. I want Mrs. Meir to come to the United Nations with figures of the United Nations, extracted from the books of the United Nations.

How on page 17 of the UNSCOP report — this is the United Nations Committee — Mr. Ben-Gurion said : «Arabs own 94 per cent of the land, the Jews only 6 per cent.» **(Official Records, General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11)**

That finishes the whole thing. That makes the statement of Mrs. Meir a fallacy and a falsehood. And unless Mrs. Meir comes to us with statistics and figures taken from the United Nations committees or agencies, it will still be a fallacy and a falsehood until Doomsday, and it will remain that.

I come to the question of sovereignty. Mrs. Meir has built the whole case with regard to the properties of the refugees on the plea of sovereignty — and I know the plea of sovereignty is most enticing to United Nations Members. She turned her face to all the delegations round this table and asked every

representative, one by one: Would you accept an intervention with regard to a domestic matter, a matter within your jurisdiction? Certainly the answer would be no. But Israel has no jurisdiction. Israel has no competence with respect to the properties of the refugees. I do not want to discuss international law on this matter. The distinguished Foreign Minister of Jordan brought to you the dictates of international law, international jurisprudence on this question. I will only put before you international law as embodied by the United Nations and United Nations resolutions. Mrs. Meir asked everybody here around this table: Do you accept any interference with your domestic jurisdiction, with your sovereignty? Certainly the answer is «No» for one simple reason.

The sovereignty of the Members of the United Nations is the expression of the will of its people; your sovereignty was made by your State, by your Government, by your people, and your constitution. Every representative here, representing a State, has a constitution at home which is made by the National Assembly, by the State — with the exception of Israel. The constitution of Israel and the sovereignty of Israel were formulated by the United Nations. No Member State in the United Nations has been given — I would say granted — a constitution by the United Nations. The General Assembly resolution of 1947 framed the constitution of Israel. The General Assembly resolution is a little booklet It is not like those resolutions that are composed of a few paragraphs. It is a whole booklet, assuming legislative and executive power. In no resolution of the United Nations have I seen the United Nations assume a legislative power, an executive power, as though it were a super-State, except on the question of Israel with regard to the partition resolution in 1947. And once in her statement here before the Committee, Mrs. Meir said: We have accepted the United Nations resolution of 1947.

But go back to the 1947 resolution. You will find two chapters, not two paragraphs, not two provisions. You will find two chapters formulating the constitution of Israel, formulating the jurisdiction of Israel: what Israel can do and what Israel cannot do. In those two chapters, the General Assembly has enumerated the provisions whereby the Arabs, as a minority, if you please, living within the Jewish State are to be protected and guarded against any action taken by Israel. This is the constitution of Israel. Israel cannot ask who of you accepts interference with your competence and jurisdiction, because no State has allowed the United Nations to make its constitution. Israel's constitution was formulated in a general outline by the resolution of 1947, in two chapters, and Mrs. Meir said here: We have accepted the resolution of 1947.

If you accepted the resolution, you accepted the fundamentals of the constitution as contained in Chapter I and II of that resolution. I will not read those chapters. I will refer you to only one paragraph, Section C, of the resolution. The United Nations resolved :

«The stipulations contained in the Declaration are recognized as fund-

amental laws of the State and no law or regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them.» **(resolution 181 (II))**

The General Assembly told Israel that no matter what legislation it makes, no matter what action it takes, because of the fundamental principles which must be contained in the constitution of Israel, no legislation should prevail over them. In those fundamental provisions, there is enough provision for the protection of the rights of the Arabs within the Jewish State, and Israel is not entitled in any way to legislate or to take any measure, administrative or otherwise, which would defeat the rights of the refugees.

So the constitution of Israel is limited. The sovereignty of Israel is subject to the provisions of the General Assembly. If you accepted the resolution of 1947, you accepted a limited jurisdiction; you accepted a limited sovereignty and you have to abide by the resolution of the General Assembly, because you are the creation of the United Nations. You are the child of the United Nations. And the certificate of birth is the 1947 resolution and you cannot go behind it, neither can you defeat it.

Here, in the resolution of the General Assembly, no Israeli legislation, no Israeli action is allowed to defeat the rights of the Arabs in Palestine. It is a constitutional right and any action, any legislation by Israel is ultra-constitutional, is **ultra vires,** is unconstitutional. And that is not the end of it. The General Assembly did not stay at that point. The Generaly Assembly said in another paragraph, of the same resolution, the following:

«The provisions of chapters 1 and 2 of the declaration shall be under the guarantee of the United Nations, and no modifications shall be made in them without the assent of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Any Member of the United Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the General Assembly any infraction or danger of infraction of any of these stipulations, and the General Assembly may thereupon make such recommendations as it may deem proper in the circumstances.»

So did not the General Assembly provide for the safeguarding of the rights of the people of Palestine? It placed them under the guarantee of the General Assembly and it gave you, gentlemen — every member seated here around this table — the right to bring to the attention of the General Assembly any infraction against the rights of the Arabs in Palestine, and no modification of those rights can be allowed — and Israel will not be allowed to do it — except with the consent of the General Assembly. So all the legislation of Israel regarding the properties of the refugees are null and void and collapse to the ground; they fall, being in violation of the General Assembly resolution, and it is your duty — each and every one of you — to bring to the attention of the General Assembly any infraction that Israel might

commit against the rights of the people of Palestine. This is your duty, and this is our right.

Again, not only has this sovereignty been limited by the General Assembly resolution but it has been denied by the Armistice Agreement; and Israel is a party to the Armistice Agreement, it signed the Armistice Agreement, and, for instance, in article II, paragraph2, of the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement of 20 July 1949, I read the following:

> «... the provisions of this agreement (are) being dictated exclusively by military, and not by political, considerations.»

Israel is there on the land on the strength of the Armistice Agreement, and the Armistice Agreement says that these provisions have no political significance, they are dictated only by military considerations. Well, if they are dictated by military considerations, then Israel has no sovereignty, and the legislation of Israel whereby it has robbed the properties of the refugees is an act that is against the very import of the Armistice Agreement and the Charter of the United Nations.

Here, now, I am not stating my position, I am arguing within the angle of the United Nations resolution. What about the areas that are beyond the Partition Plan? Those areas are held by conquest, if you please; by a military operation. So in those areas Israel definitely has no jurisdiction and it cannot legislate with regard to those areas which are beyond the Partition Plan. And, again, with regard to the Jerusalem area — here again I am not stating my position, but I am arguing within United Nations jurisprudence — you decided under a 1947 resolution and various other resolutions that Jerusalem should be made into a **corpus separatum** with effective internationalization. This means that Israel has no jurisdiction in Jerusalem; this means that Israel has no sovereignty in Jerusalem. The sovereignty lies with the United Nations. I am arguing your resolution, not my position. If Jerusalem is a **corpus separatum** under international rule, then the sovereignty belongs to the United Nations, not to Israel. So if Israel legislates with regard to areas in Jerusalem, contrary to the United Nations resolution, against your sovereignty, it would be encroaching upon United Nations sovereignty, and such legislation would be void, would be null.

Professor Toynbee in dealing with this matter — the property of the refugees — in the Encylopaedia Britannica's Book of the Year 1959 — and this is not one of the latest editions, so that there is no genuine complaint for our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom that this is a recent publication — says :

> «It has sometimes been argued that the Palestinian Arab refugees forfeited their rights to their property on the Israeli side of the armistice line by not remaining in their homes during the hostilities in 1948. This is a doctrine that has not been, and will not be, accepted in the civilized

> world. If this doctrine were approved, we should have to conclude that the Nazis were justified in seizing the property of Jews who had the foresight and the opportunity to escape from Germany.»

I shall leave this recital without a comment because it is self-condemnatory to the deeds of Israel with regard to the property of the refugees.

But what is more important is that those refugees who are living in camps across the armistice line every sunrise and every sunset witness their land, they witness their orange groves that they have themselves planted, and if they go in to pick the oranges they are killed — they are shot down dead.

This is the first instance in the civilized world where a man is killed because he approaches his property. I say that because we have here a recital from Mr. Hutchinson's book, «Violent Truce» — he was the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission:

> «... many Arabs were killed inside Israel while trying to retrieve items from their former homes or harvests from the lands they once possessed» — in Palestine.

So, not only are they denied their right to their property, but they are killed when they approach their property. This is the only instance in our civilized era where a man is killed because he approaches his home. And it is for you now to judge.

The refugee situation is one which calls for action under the Genocide Convention. In article II, with regard to the definition of genocide, we read the following:

> «... genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial or religious group...
>
> (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part». **(General Assembly resolution 260 (III)**

This is your definition of genocide.

Mr. Davis in his report told you that at least thousands and thousands of people are being now exposed through starvation to death. The 7,000 Azazmehs, the 325,000 persons who are not able to be claimants of any relief under the definition of «refugee» by the United Nations Agency, are being exposed to death by starvation, and this is genocide; and I call your attention to take action with regard to this genocide, to prevent genocide. If we cannot facilitate the repatriation of the people of Palestine immediately to their homes, let us at least avoid the commission of the crime of genocide by allowing those people, not to get your mercy, not to live on six cents a day, not to be on the rolls of Mr. Davis, but to be allowed to farm their lands, to live on their own toil, to live in dignity on their own lands and properties that have been seized

and robbed by the Israelis.

We are being asked to live in peace under the slogan «peaceful coexistence». There can be no peaceful existence except when the existence is legitimate, except when such existence is lawful. There cannot be peaceful coexistence between the robber and the robbed, between the oppressed and the oppressor. You have to remove oppression, you have to remove robbery, first, in order to get to peaceful coexistence. But you cannot ask the criminal and those inflicted with the crime to lead a life of peaceful coexistence.

In the third paragraph, in the preamble to the international instrument of human rights, we read as follows :

> «Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law».

When human rights are protected by the rule of law, you can ask for peaceful coexistence, but there can be no coexistence with aggression, neither with military invasion or occupation. This is not peaceful coexistence, this is simply plunder, human indignity.

The preamble of the UNESCO Constitution states :

> « ... War (was) made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men».

Let me, for one or two minutes, sum up our position. This is the concluding statement of my delegation, on behalf of my people, and it is my duty after this lengthy survey of the Palestine problem, and the Palestine refugees' problem, to sum up our position in the following assertions.

First, repatriation is our right, without qualification or reservation; a repatriation to the **patrie**, our ancestal home, Palestine.

Secondly, on the refugee question and on the Palestine question as a whole, the United Nations should address itself to us, the people of Palestine. The people of Palestine are the principal party to the Palestine problem. The Arab States are under a national duty to defend our cause by all the means at their disposal. But the final destiny of our people, the people of Palestine, and the future of our country shall be determined by our people. It is we who accept, it is we who reject.

Thirdly, any resolution calling for negotiations between Israel and the Arab States shall be of no avail. Such a resolution would be addressed to the wrong party. The Arab States are not the rightful party for negotiations with regard to the rights of the refugees. The Arab States are no party to negotiate the national rights of the people of Palestine.

However, Mr. Chairman, negotiations are not the proper course to follow in the refugee question, or the Palestine question as a whole. The refugee question can only be solved by repatriation, rather than by negotiation.

With regard to the Palestine question as a whole, a reconsideration and not negotiation is the master key to the whole problem; it must be a basic reconsideration on a clean sheet, without the 1947 resolution and all it has established. All assumptions upon which this resolution was built have proved, so far, in the last fifteen years, to be unfounded, and the objectives which it sought to achieve have not been achieved : peace, in the main, has not been realized and the danger to peace in the area, and in the world at large, as Mr. Davis has told you, is «constant» and «imminent».

Fourthly, the only solution lies in the recognition of the right of the people of Palestine, the legitimate people of Palestine, to live in their homeland in dignity and liberty and with their national sovereignty.

Fifthly, should the United Nations continue a policy of inaction, continue its indifference and should the United Nations make no serious effort to restore our rights, we, the people of Palestine, shall seek by all means to regain our homes, our lands and our homeland.

As a colonial issue, the problem of Palestine can only be solved through an Algerian solution, and you know what an Algerian solution means, from beginning to end. It may become necessary to start a liberation movement, and a liberation movement with a liberation army shall be established. And here I end my statement.

Printed by GHORAYEB PRESS
Beirut — Lebanon

Price : 5.00 Lebanese Pounds