

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
34th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 18 November 1983  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. STARCEVIC (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 73: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)
- (c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE (continued)
- (d) REPORT OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)
- (e) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee

Distr. GENERAL  
A/SPC/38/PV.34  
31 January 1984

ENGLISH

48 p.  
84-60297 2724V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 73 (continued)

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST:  
(A/SPC/38/L.13 and L.14)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL (A/38/13)
- (b) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (A/38/55)
- (c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE (A/38/397)
- (d) REPORT OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (A/38/143 and Add.1)
- (e) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, (A/38/149, 361 and Add.1, 382, 386, 418, 419 and 420)

Mr. BENCHEKROUN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Having ventured into outer space in a futile search for deliverance from earthly tribulations, here we are again, faced with what unfortunately is most typical of our times: our hatreds, our disputes, our misdeeds, our pettiness, our meanness and our miserable quarrels - in a word, what inveterate pessimists would call the human condition. That would seem to justify the arguments of those who totally condemn outer space adventures and who advocate settling problems on earth before going on to create others elsewhere.

Here we are again, meeting - as in a sinister and static ritual - to hear the many cries of distress, the lamentations and the despairing of the international community. These cries are directed against the behaviour of a single State Member of the United Nations, because of its constant and obstinate refusal to see justice done to refugees which it has expelled from their lands and homes; against the actions of a single nation born of suffering and injustice taken against other nations which it in turn has condemned - in the past, in the present and forever more - to suffering and injustice.

That is the remarkable position of a country which persists in attempting to hold its views against 155 other States of our world Organization; it is that country's sorry privilege to confront the whole of mankind. This indeed makes Israel different from other nations and it is no surprise that the international community is seeking to put it in the dock. It is some considerable distinction to

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

stand stubbornly against everyone, even if that stubbornness can lead to only one result, which we can all guess.

The various reports before us are eloquent in more than one respect. They show their authors' dedication and profound knowledge of the problems in the region and of the seriousness of those problems. An accusing finger points from the pages to identify both the responsibilities and where they lie, perhaps with undue moderation in the face of certain enormities, but in the surest and most irrevocable fashion, with neither verbal excesses nor attempts at provocation.

What, then, do these reports convey to us this year? Perhaps nothing more than what was conveyed in similar reports of earlier years, except that in 1983 they overwhelm us with a thousand pieces of new evidence about the intolerable behaviour of the Israeli authorities towards Palestine refugees and about the deteriorating situation in the refugee camps. Israel seems to have tried to mark 1982 with a sinister black milestone, signalling a point of no return along the road of repression and harassment against the Palestinians and against any organization which represents them or which desires to assist or aid them in their distress and misfortune.

All wars have involved refugees and refugee camps. Because those refugees and camps have often been the object of harassment and hostility and because in general the refugees are civilians, the international community has established conventions and treaties to lessen the rigours of exile for these forced refugees and to spare them, to some small degree at least, the repressions which could be inflicted on them by their gaolers, or "guardian angels". Since the adoption of those agreements, refugees have generally enjoyed, if not an enviable situation, at least a relatively peaceful and tranquil one as they await better days.

But what is the situation of the Palestine refugees? It must be said that, since the very establishment of the Jewish State, the international laws and conventions and their benefits have not only not been applied to them, but have been constantly violated and trampled under foot by means of the collective punishment of whole sectors of the population, by massive destruction of dwellings, and by the imposition of harsh, prolonged and often unjustified curfews. Add to this insecurity and a lack of protection, and you will find it difficult to imagine a more intolerable and unfortunate situation than the present situation in the Palestinian areas controlled by Israel. This appears now to be the rule of Israeli policy towards these people, which sets a new record of aberration.

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

This too distinguishes the Israeli authorities in their defiance of the world and their physical and, above all, moral isolation from the rest of the mankind. Comparisons with the South African régime are no mere bad joke or rhetorical figure; they are a true reflection of the fundamentally racist nature of the apartheid system and of the system now governing the behaviour of the Israeli authorities towards the Palestine refugees.

Health, housing, education, safety, security and protection are all areas in which the Israeli authorities undertake harassment and repression. The Israeli authorities want nothing more than for these refugees to give up and leave forever. Since, however, they refuse to play the game, the Israelis appear to have redoubled their efforts through last year's invasion of Lebanon, hewing to the policy of le dernier quart d'heure, the celebrated phrase of the no less celebrated, and sinister, ally of the 1956 Suez campaign, the socialist Lacoste. We know where that quarter of an hour led and how it ended.

The Israeli authorities claimed that their invasion of Lebanon was an attempt to ensure the protection of their northern borders, a claim which was quickly contradicted by the facts. The true goal was to occupy southern Lebanon and enter Beirut, the capital of an Arab country and the symbol of coexistence among different religions and ethnic groups. This symbol had to be wiped out of the region at all costs. Here too we see a sinister distinction of the Israeli authorities: their attempt to destroy any symbol of coexistence and dialogue among ethnic groups and religions. Those authorities have taken up the torch of the colonial Powers: the policy of the stick and the tough line, the only line which can break the resistance of the indigene. For it must be stated that a Jewish settler from the Ukraine, Poland or Germany is no different from the settler from certain other parts of Europe - he may be worse. He gives free rein to a kind of criminal fury not seen even during the worst moments of the Second World War.

Destruction, killing, senseless bombings are the lot of Palestine refugee camps and, now, of innocent Lebanese who seek in vain to flee the bands of Israeli soldiery. When the thirst for killing is somewhat abated, it will be time for mass internments - blind and indiscriminate - mixing young and old, Arabs and non-Arabs, men and women, Lebanese and Palestinians, Christians and Moslems. Anyone is likely to be put behind barbed wire: anyone who is not a Jew. Not only are the older refugee camps destroyed, but the survivors are not permitted to rebuild.

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

Concentration camps are set up for those over whom the heavy hand of the Israeli soldier has fallen. These camps and certain other concentration camps of infamous memory - camps which some Israelis have dark recollections - are as alike as two drops of water.

In these conditions, how can effective aid be provided to the Palestine refugees for whom the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was set up, unless the repression, abuses and destruction of the Israeli leaders are not brought to a halt. UNRWA is trying to maintain at the very least a minimum of decent life in the camps, but the vulture is constantly upsetting everything. Even Israel's friends - whose friendship and support have survived the worst trials and whose commitment has persisted at the expense of other friendships and other, more honourable and just, prospects - do not understand; or rather they try to block their ears and close their eyes, rejecting true understanding of the Israeli attitude. Every time, they are willing to accept, like a stroke of bad luck, whatever the Israeli magicians pull out of their hats.

Throughout the world, even in the most remote corners of the earth, peoples and Governments have enormous respect for all those who concern themselves with the suffering of their fellow creatures. The doctor, the pharmacist, the healer - even the sorcerer and the charlatan - command respect within the societies to which they belong. Both in time of peace and in time of strife they are held in high esteem. Both in time of peace and in time of war, the international Red Crescent and Red Cross, as well as other welfare organizations, enjoy privileges and immunities for their personnel and equipment which enable them to help, to relieve suffering and come to the assistance of victims, even if only on the moral level. The founding fathers of these noble principles could not contemplate the misfortunes of others without wanting to comfort them, without thought of politics, religion or race.

Israel does this too, and its numerous adversaries admit it freely. But this is in respect of Israel and Israelis. But what about the territories occupied by this new colonial Power? What about the refugee camps? There it is an entirely different story, as even the Israelis admit, who no longer deny that there are exceptions, the principal one being the human species known as the Palestinian.

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

While in our contemporary society it is accepted that the dead or wounded, that the elderly, children and pregnant women are deserving of a certain compassion and that they should receive some consideration in time of war, what do we see in the treatment inflicted on the Palestine refugees? The sick, the wounded, the young, the pregnant, the aged - destitute and defenceless, as naked as when they came into the world - none of them have the right to the slightest sympathy or even less the most basic protection from the Israeli occupation authorities.

This is a matter which must be made to disappear, and certain Israelis seem to be determined to do all in their power to bring this about. The behaviour of the Israeli army in the Sabra and Shatila massacres, going as far as helping and protecting those who were attacking the wounded who lay on the operating tables already close to death; the establishment of concentration camps, which we had all thought to be forever banished from human awareness: these are but two sinister examples which will forever blemish the Israeli leaders, marking them as true criminals for future generations. In that respect too, Israel - or rather its leaders - will be distinguished, and how distinguished!

While throughout the world, refugees are respected and there are attempts to comfort and protect them, the Israeli authorities offer hostility and misfortune to the Palestine refugees. Rather than comforting them, the Israelis provide them with discomfort and harassment. Rather than sheltering the homeless, the young Israeli soldiers are destroying whatever miserable hovels they may possess. Rather than treating them, Israeli officers order hospitals and infirmaries to be razed. Rather than protecting them against attack, the Israeli army assists the assailants and closes its eyes to the most abominable crimes. In a word, rather than offering them a new life, the Israeli leaders take away what little is left of their lives.

All of this is duly noted in the reports before us, and there is no need to dot the Is, for many paragraphs are eloquent in themselves. The saddest part of this dark tragedy is that while the world is, of course, horrified at Israel's actions, it is unable to react effectively because it is paralyzed with fascination at the enormous audacity of a State which has made military force its motto and its god. That force has grown so great that even the protectors and benefactors of Israel are beginning to feel dizzy. And that too constitutes not the least or least notable distinction of Israel: to instill fear, first and foremost in its friends and allies. The Palestinians feel no more fear.

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

Jews have always been in the vanguard of knowledge and of all sorts of intellectual disciplines. They have been involved in the various struggles which brought about the triumph of progress over backwardness and conservatism. Frequently, moved by generous ideas, they have led revolutions. It must be recognized that their impact on the course of history is well established. With that brilliant past, one might have thought that the culture of others - especially that of their nearest relations, the Palestinians - would have found a certain merit in their eyes. But what do we actually see? Rather than opening schools and universities, they close them. Rather than encouraging learning, they sabotage it. Rather than spreading culture and knowledge, they force them out. Is this the scholarly, cultivated and humanistic Jew? Rather than taking on an intellectual competition with equals, they will accept only subjugation. The Hebrew University is brilliant and glorious, but why is the establishment of a university at Al Quds not permitted, to give direction and impetus to the development of another indigenous culture in a place which saw the flowering of many cultures and many religions? We must believe that certain Israeli Jews are afraid of intellectual confrontation with any culture which is not their own and shy away from any kind of emulation not specifically to their advantage.

This time they have locked themselves of their own free will into a sort of spiritual ghetto, and they are struggling in it. But, unfortunately, they will continue to struggle there until they accept the inevitable: dialogue with their adversaries. The Arabs have tried to help them in this, but the Fez plan, which could have marked the beginning of a whole series of rapprochements, was, unfortunately, rejected, with, moreover, the contempt of Israeli leaders. Yet the name of that plan was prestigious and highly symbolic, bearing witness to the depth and degree of its authors' sincerity: it was the name of a city which had welcomed numerous Jewish and Moslem refugees who had fled the Spanish inquisition, and the university of which was the catalyst for the flowering of that monument of Jewish intellect and erudition, Maimonides, for whom the Sephardim and we Moroccans have the greatest respect, but for whom, I fear, the Ashkenazim have nothing but indifference.

Thus, we see everywhere a categorical refusal by the Israeli authorities to entertain any Arab proposal which would safeguard the interests of all in the region. Such stubborn rejection is not a sign of good health, and in this respect,

(Mr. Benchekroun, Morocco)

today more than ever, Israel's health appears to us to be more than weakened, morally, intellectually and, so they say, materially. Is this the beginning of a decadence, the harbinger of coming storms? It would be terrible if that were true. It would be unworthy of a people, a history and a culture which have given so greatly of themselves to mankind, in knowledge, in science, in culture, in humanism and in civilization. We believe that there is still hope for redressing this situation: if they will extend their hands to their adversaries instead of rejoicing in their misfortunes; if they will accept each other mutually and open themselves to the culture and civilization of their neighbours. We think that without that there can be salvation neither for the Israelis nor the Palestinians - nor, for that matter, for all those who want genuine Arab-Israeli reconciliation.

The siren-cries of intransigence, both within and outside Israel and the highly doubtful friendship of certain allies must more than ever dictate a certain circumspection to the Tel Aviv authorities. Is it not said, "God protect me from my friends: I shall take care of my enemies"? It is high time that the Israeli leaders finally became aware of this and learned a lesson from it. In their intransigence, they should realize that, despite everything, the Jewish people does not have only enemies and that many people hope that the Israelis will ultimately recover their reason and their sense of balance.

It is in that context that we shall continue to support and strengthen the activities of UNRWA.

Mr. ABOUASSI (Lebanon): My delegation has carefully studied the report of the Commissioner-General, contained in document A/38/13, as well as all the other documents before us pertaining to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). We wish to join other delegations in expressing our appreciation for the commendable efforts deployed by the Commissioner-General and his staff in preparing those reports and in helping to achieve UNRWA's humanitarian tasks.

It appears from reading these reports that foremost among the concerns which have occupied the Agency over the past year has been the situation in Lebanon. It appears also that the question of the personal protection of the Palestinian refugees is considered by the Commissioner-General, as he states in the foreword to his report, to be the most serious problem facing the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. While sincerely sharing this concern over the safety and fate of the



(Mr. Abouassi, Lebanon)

Palestinians in the troubled Middle East, the delegation of Lebanon wishes to make the following observations and remarks concerning the protection of the Palestinians in Lebanon.

It should be remembered, first, that the Palestinian refugees have been in Lebanon since 1948. Many Lebanese still recall the emotional appeal addressed to the Lebanese people by the late President of the Republic of Lebanon, Bishara al-Khouri, in which he called on the Lebanese to open their homes and hearts to the flow of Palestinian refugees pouring into Lebanon - which they did. As a matter of fact, Lebanon has become a haven for refugees and for the persecuted, who found in the free and democratic Lebanese society an ideal place to express themselves and their aspirations, and to take advantage of all the facilities offered to them, while respecting the laws of the host country.

My next remark is that there should be a distinction between the Lebanese regions under the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon and those regions out of its effective control. Thus, Israeli forces are still occupying southern Lebanon as a result of the June 1982 invasion, whereas the Lebanese army was prevented from reaching those regions and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was not allowed fully to carry out its mandate or to have that mandate expanded so that it might fulfil a role of deterrence and protection.

In northern Lebanon and in the Beqa'a, on the other hand, non-Lebanese forces are still illegally present and are exercising effective control over the land, with occasional fighting among the different factions, leading to suffering for the innocent, afflicted civilian population.

As for the regions under Lebanese Government authority, especially the Beirut area, which was mentioned also in the Commissioner-General's report, we should like to emphasize that the Government of Lebanon is doing all possible to secure the safety of Lebanese and Palestinians alike. Assisted by the United Nations observers and the multinational force, the Lebanese Government has largely succeeded in re-establishing security and stability in the greater Beirut area, and not only in restoring some feeling of security in the camps, as is mentioned in the Commissioner-General's report.

From a broader perspective, my delegation deems it useful to make the following additional observations: first, it is not possible as a general rule to separate the question of protection from the question of security and the necessity

(Mr. Abouassi, Lebanon)

to respect the host country's laws. It is only by respecting the security imperatives in Lebanon today that we can better ensure protection and prevent the recurrence of violence, killing and bloodshed.

Secondly, it is not possible to speak about protection of the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon in a vacuum. Rather, one should consider the geographic, social and political context in which they are living. For the last 15 years, the camps have been transformed into closed and fortified barracks. The people of Lebanon suffered during the last eight years - and are still suffering - tragedies which have caused the death of 100,000, the displacement of 500,000 Lebanese in their own land and the expatriation of 200,000, the maiming or other permanent injury of tens of thousands, and the destruction of dozens of cities and towns.

The third principle is that it is not possible to speak about the security of the Palestinian refugees without speaking at the same time about the security of the Lebanese civilians. The war of others, waged on Lebanese soil in northern Lebanon, is additional proof of the interdependence between the security of the Palestinians and that of the Lebanese, whose safety is the prime responsibility of the Lebanese Government. Therefore, when we refer to the detention by the Lebanese authorities of a number of Palestinians or Lebanese, it would be fair also to refer to the magnitude of the security problems facing Lebanon and its people at this most critical stage, and to point as well to the considerations which compel the Lebanese authorities to take such action in conformity with the law, especially to the fact that a large number of foreign residents have turned to illegal actions, resorting with impunity to such reprehensible acts as murder, aggression, illegal possession of weapons and explosives, large-scale forgery and illegal acquisition of property.

Unhappy or not, the Lebanese people have definitely been facing tragedy, suffering and destruction. But despite all that, they have not lost their faith and their resolve to survive and to rebuild their country. Lebanon is determined to uphold and maintain its sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized boundaries. Lebanon is also determined to liberate its national soil from all unauthorized non-Lebanese forces and to extend the unifying authority of the State to every inch of its territory. It is important to stress here that only a strong and just State can provide the needed protection, security and dignity to the Lebanese people and to the other

(Mr. Abouassi, Lebanon)

legal inhabitants of Lebanon. It is also to be recalled that the Government of Lebanon has already expressed its desire and readiness to welcome international forces on its soil, to assist in realizing Lebanon's national aspirations and help provide more safety and security if needed.

It is a fact that Lebanon is the oldest constitutional democracy in the Middle East. Its Constitution goes back to 1926, and the succession of civilian power has been carried out peacefully, through democratic elections, every six years. Moreover, Lebanon has never committed aggression or plotted against anybody. It has distinguished itself by being a land of freedom and a haven for refugees. We are still determined to preserve our heritage and our impeccable record as a nation respectful of international law and of all human rights.

I wish therefore to reaffirm that the Lebanese Government considers that all Palestinians and other foreigners residing legally in Lebanon are under the protection of Lebanese law, as are Lebanese nationals. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lebanon also reaffirmed this position during the General Assembly debate on 30 September 1983, when he said that

"To the Palestinians whose presence in Lebanon is legal we say that we recommit ourselves to them in this world forum and reaffirm that they will enjoy all rights and privileges provided by the law. They will thus be able to resume a normal and secure life, unequalled in its freedom and its cultural implications in any other country in the Middle East." (A/38/PV.14, p. 138-140) Operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 37/120 J, adopted last year, states the following:

"Urges the Commissioner-General to provide housing, in consultation with the Government of Lebanon, to the Palestinian refugees whose houses were demolished or razed by the Israeli forces, in order to protect them from the severity of the weather."

The Lebanese Government has responded to that request, in addition to that it had already started to secure housing within the means available at the time.

Besides its readiness to assist in providing housing, the Lebanese officials have also informed the Commissioner-General of UNRWA of the authorization to that Agency to reconstruct the camps. In that connection, the delegation of Lebanon wishes to draw attention to the fact that, in the view of the Lebanese officials, the implementation of such a reconstruction policy, in co-ordination with UNRWA,

(Mr. Abouassi, Lebanon)

must take into account the following important factors: first, the geographical distribution of the camps in respect of which some time would be needed while awaiting a decision from the Lebanese officials indicating the site on which the houses should be built, in the light of security and technical considerations; secondly, it should be understood that the Palestinians concerned are only those legally registered in Lebanon; and, thirdly, the financing and implementation should be with the approval of and in co-ordination with the Lebanese Government, in accordance with the relevant United Nations General Assembly resolutions.

To carry out such a commitment in principle to rebuild the houses, the Government of Lebanon is studying the possibility of forming a committee drawn from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence, the Directorate of Urban Planning and UNRWA to study the subject from all its political, security and administrative aspects. The human consideration shall always be uppermost in our minds and we shall co-operate with the Commissioner-General of UNRWA and his staff towards the fulfilment of his mandate.

The financial difficulties still facing UNRWA remain serious and a matter of concern, especially for the host countries. Lebanon considers it imperative to continue seeking suitable solutions to that problem. The failure to meet UNRWA's needs would add to the frustrations of the Palestinians and exacerbate further the prevailing tension and bitterness. In that respect, it is relevant to recall the following Arab saying: "To open a school is to close a prison".

On this occasion my delegation would like to express its thanks for the efforts carried out by the Joint Inspection Unit in preparing its report and for the endeavours of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA.

The subject under discussion today is one of relief, and the international community bears a great responsibility in this matter. UNRWA, which is carrying out a humanitarian task in the Middle East, is performing a concrete job and contributing to increasing the confidence of world public opinion in the usefulness of the United Nations, in spite of the fact that the political aspect of the problem of the Palestinian people has, unfortunately, not yet been solved.

Lebanon, which has contributed much to the Agency's humanitarian efforts, is looking forward to more co-operation and co-ordination with the Commissioner-General and his assistants in the realization of UNRWA's humanitarian goals.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like now, in my capacity as representative of Yugoslavia, to make the following statement.

The annual report of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), submitted to us by its Commissioner-General, Mr. Olaf Rydbeck, once again represents a moving testimony to the continuing ordeal of the Palestinian people. Forcibly expelled from their land, deprived of their homes and property, and stripped of human rights in the territories occupied by Israel, the Palestine refugees are the protagonists of one of the most tragic stories of our time. They have been deprived of their homeland and denied the right to national self-determination. Yet, their sense of national identity and national aspirations has never faltered, despite grave sacrifices. They have shown to all those that had thought otherwise - above all, Israel - that it is illusory to expect that the Palestinian problem can be made to disappear without the achievement of a just and lasting solution, no matter what amount of force is used against them.

And, indeed, there seems to be no limit to the force used and the suffering inflicted. The carefully measured language of United Nations documents used in the UNRWA report discloses nevertheless the magnitude of the Palestinian tragedy, further increased after the Israeli aggression against Lebanon in June of last year. The atrocious killing of hundreds of the Palestinian civilian population in the Sabra and Shatila camps - for which Israel bears full responsibility - had a profound impact on the security of all Palestinians in Lebanon. The personal security of the Palestine refugees, as stressed in the foreword to the UNRWA report, was the most serious problem in the period under consideration. Innumerable detentions, threats and killings of Palestinians occurred during that period. While UNRWA has reported, warned and made representations to the authorities, there are clear limits as to what that Agency can do in such circumstances. Suffice it to say that even UNRWA staff is killed and detained - a reprehensible violation of immunities of international organizations and clearly in violation of existing international law. The responsibility for such acts is borne by the occupying Power, which is Israel.

It is beyond comprehension how some States can support UNRWA and its programmes and yet fall short of censuring Israel for acts that call into question the very continuation of those programmes. The words of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon largely undid the Agency's work of

(The Chairman)

30 years in Lebanon cannot and must not be taken lightly. The destruction of refugee houses inside and outside the camps in southern Lebanon and Beirut and the demolition of refugee shelters by Israel as punitive measures have created a massive housing shortage that the Agency was called upon to alleviate. Also, it had to undertake emergency relief programmes, including welfare assistance to some 185,000 refugees, which placed a heavy burden on the Agency's already limited resources. The Agency had not yet succeeded in collecting \$13 million for the initial phase of emergency reconstruction of UNRWA installations, camp infrastructure and refugee housing.

At the same time, the Agency had to cope with continuous disruptions of its operations in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza owing to Israeli interference and obstruction.

Yet, in spite of almost insuperable difficulties, the Agency had succeeded in restoring the greatest possible degree of normality to the lives of Palestine refugees caught in the turbulence of events in Lebanon. It was able rapidly to re-establish its own health services, good progress was made in reactivating the school system and remarkable successes were made, in the circumstances, in reconstructing the refugee housing facilities. All that was achieved by the Agency while carrying on its regular operations in Syria, Jordan, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

The devotion and sense of purpose shown by the Commissioner-General and UNRWA staff throughout this extraordinary relief operation have been exemplary indeed, and my delegation wishes to express its highest appreciation for their services.

Against that background, the great importance of UNRWA's continuing activities becomes even more evident. Could we imagine the effects of events in Lebanon upon the Palestine refugees if UNRWA either did not exist or was forced to discontinue its activities owing to a lack of funds? The current events in the north of Lebanon show that the state of emergency in which the Agency operates is far from over and that the same urgent need for its relief operation continues. The vital need for all of its other activities also remains undiminished.

UNRWA's assistance to the Palestine refugees is indeed more than ever an essential lifeline; it is also a stabilizing factor in the volatile situation prevailing in the Middle East region. Established as an expression of the international community's solidarity with the suffering people of Palestine, UNRWA

(The Chairman)

has no alternative as long as there is no political solution of the problem of the Middle East. It must therefore be provided with sufficient funds to be able to carry out its noble humanitarian tasks in accordance with the existing needs of the Palestine refugees.

The international community has a moral obligation to provide the necessary funding for UNRWA. Therefore, my delegation wholeheartedly supports the appeals of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group for increased contributions to the Agency's budget. The favourable circumstances that existed during the 1983 budget year will not be repeated next year, which can be seen from the fact that the total contributions this year has not yet reached last year's level.

In this connection, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation of both the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA and that of the Joint Inspection Unit. Many conclusions and recommendations in those reports are very valuable, and I am certain that they will be considered favourably by the Agency and the General Assembly.

My country will continue to make its contribution to the international community's efforts to assist the Palestinian refugees to the utmost of its possibilities. Yugoslavia contributes regularly to the Agency's budget, gives it assistance in food and other goods and provides scholarships for studies at its schools and universities. It stands ready to support every action intended to secure UNRWA's continuing successful work.

Important and indispensable as UNRWA's work is, it is certainly no solution for the problem of Palestine refugees. That problem can be resolved only through finding a just and comprehensive solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

The non-aligned countries have been the main bulwark of support for the Palestinian people and its just cause. They have given the strongest support to the just struggle of its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. They have formulated their views, which have been reiterated on a number of occasions including at the Seventh Summit in New Delhi, as to what are the necessary elements of a just solution of the problem of Palestine, which is the core of the Middle East crisis: the attainment and exercise in Palestine of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return, self-determination without external interference and the right to national independence and sovereignty, including the right to establish an independent

(The Chairman)

Palestinian State. The realization of those rights, together with the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967 and recognition of the right of all countries and peoples of the region to a safe, independent and peaceful social development, within recognized boundaries free from the threat or use of force, is the only way to eliminate the problem of Palestine refugees and to solve the Middle East problem. While continuing with the maximum support of UNRWA, it is the political solution along the aforementioned lines that the international community should be seeking, exerting all efforts towards achieving that goal.

There are no more names on the speakers' list. We have thus concluded the general debate on agenda item 73.

I call on the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, who wishes to make a closing statement.

Mr. RYDBECK (Commissioner-General, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)): I have listened most attentively to the debate on the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), which has been conducted in this Committee over the past 10 days, and I thank the Committee for giving me the opportunity to make some further remarks at its close.

I am very gratified by the generous tributes paid to the Agency and its staff by the members of the Committee which I shall be very happy to pass on to my colleagues. These are indeed, as many representatives have said, extremely difficult times in which we are endeavouring to carry out our mandate, and we need all the co-operation and support which Member States can give us.

A number of representatives have expressed concern over one of the obstacles which has been placed in our way - the detention of a number of locally recruited staff. The Secretary-General and I have made a particular point of drawing the attention of Member States to these detentions, not because we challenge the right of any Government to enforce law and order within its borders - far from it. Our concern is to preserve the fundamental rights of the United Nations and its staff to know on what charges detainees are individually being held; to be informed of the places where they are being detained; and to be granted access to them. The latest reports that have reached me indicate that there are still in Lebanon five staff members being held by the Lebanese authorities and 61 by the Israeli authorities, for whom those rights have not been assured. My annual report also



(Mr. Rydbeck)

recalls that other staff members have been similarly held without charge in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza and in the Syrian Arab Republic during the reporting period.

The occupied territories, as the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has reminded us, continue to be in the throes of tension, violence and measures aimed at restoring order which at the same time inflict hardship. Since I made my opening statement to this Committee on 9 November, curfews have been imposed - sometimes for a few hours, at others for several days - on the refugee camps at Aida, Balata, Dheisheh, Jalazone and Tulkarem. UNRWA has generally been able to arrange with the Israeli authorities to provide health and sanitation services during daytime hours when the curfews have been partially lifted. But these efforts have run into difficulties where, as in Dheisheh, the main entrance to the camp has been closed, preventing transportation of garbage to the collection points on the main roads and blocking the flow of drainage water. UNRWA's Field Office is consulting the military authorities in an attempt to reach a practical solution to this problem.

In my earlier statement I referred to the closure by the Israeli authorities of a school at the Kalandia Camp and the Kalandia Vocational Training Centre for one month from 1 November. That closure remains in force, and the authorities are still examining UNRWA's proposal to reinforce a section of the compound wall at the school so as to guard further against the possibility that stones could be thrown over it at passing vehicles. Since then orders have been given for two UNRWA schools in the Jalazone Camp to be closed for one month from 15 November. Our Field Director in Jerusalem has requested the reason for this decision, but has yet to be given it. I am deeply concerned by this form of action which punishes large numbers of children for alleged offences by unidentified perpetrators. A press release calling public attention to the school closures was issued today.

The plight of civilian refugees in the area in and around Tripoli in north Lebanon has gravely exercised us over these past weeks. The most recent reports I have received from UNRWA's Field Office in Lebanon speak of 9,000 to 10,000 Palestine refugees displaced from the Beddawi Camp and living in UNRWA and Government schools or with relatives in Tripoli town; another 200 families from Beddawi fled to the Nahr El Bared Camp; and hundreds more have been living in air-raid shelters in Beddawi Camp itself, where their health condition has been

(Mr. Rydbeck)

worrying. As of 14 November - before the latest rounds of heavy shelling of the Beddawi Camp and further fighting in Tripoli - the numbers of civilian registered refugees who had been killed were reported at 90, and 140 were believed to have been wounded. I would emphasize that those figures do not take into account casualties among the rest of the civilian population in the area nor among combatants. I have figures relating only to registered UNRWA refugees. An updated estimate of the damage there will be made when the fighting has ceased, but by 11 November, 80 to 90 refugee shelters had already been destroyed and more than 100 damaged. In the Nahr El Bared Camp there were 22 destroyed shelters and 30 damaged. The impact of the fighting on the Agency's own installations appears to have been light in Nahr El Bared. Surveys of this damage and of the repairs and replacements needed to the roads, sewage and water distribution networks and other infrastructure in the two camps will be carried out shortly.

In the last fortnight an emergency operation has been mounted to meet the immediate relief needs of the refugees. Distributions have been made of foodstuffs - flour, sugar, rice, sardines, corned beef, jam and tomato paste - soap and towels, blankets and mattresses, and kitchen kits. They have already reached more than 2,500 refugees still in the Beddawi Camp and 7,200 in Tripoli. The supplies have been provided from the stocks held from the continuing emergency relief programme elsewhere in Lebanon, in the Agency's warehouses in Beirut and the Beka'a Valley - and will, of course, have to be replaced. If the rehabilitation of the refugees cannot take place within a short time, as seems likely to be the case, a further food ration will be issued. In addition, supplementary feeding will be given for the next three months to 3,000 refugees who are in need of it. Cash grants and/or building materials will assist those who can restore their homes in the camps.

Another immediate task has been to reinforce the health services. As I reported on 9 November, UNRWA has been working with the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Lebanese Red Cross to provide medical staff and supplies for the Islamic Hospital and a temporary annex to it in Tripoli town. An UNRWA health point in the town has been open daily instead of the normal twice-weekly hours. The Nahr El Bared Health Centre resumed work on 8 November, and arrangements were being made for a mobile clinic to bring medical care to the refugees in Beddawi

(Mr. Rydbeck)

until it was safe for the health centre there to reopen. An agreement had been reached with two hospitals in Akkar to receive from the Nahr El Bared Camp UNRWA patients who are unable to reach Tripoli. A vaccination campaign has been mounted to protect children from the risk of polio and measles. Additional milk powder is being issued through the child-health clinics. An interesting example of co-operation has been the purchase by UNRWA of a 37 KVA generator delivered to the Islamic Hospital in Tripoli. Half of the cost has been covered by the United Kingdom Save the Children Fund and the other half is more than met by donation to the Agency of 1,500 blankets from the International Committee of the Red Cross, which will use the generator.

This operation will add approximately \$750,000 to the Agency's expenditure on emergency relief in Lebanon. When the cost of repairing UNRWA's own installations and the camp infrastructure is assessed, the total bill could be well over \$1 million. This assumes that the needs do not continue beyond the three months, and, of course, we have no way yet of knowing how realistic that assumption is.

Mounting this emergency operation has placed an additional burden on UNRWA's resources which can be met without prejudice to the regular programmes only if the international community makes special contributions for the purpose. I spoke at the start of this debate of the modest response so far to my last appeal for Lebanon, a response which has not increased since then. I also warned of the serious risk of an alarming shortage of funds to keep the education, health and welfare programmes going in 1984. While I look forward to the announcement of generous contributions at the Pledging Conference for UNRWA next Tuesday, 22 November, nothing I have heard suggests that my fears for next year may be unfounded.

It is in this context that I ask members to consider the request which several representatives have made for resumption of the basic ration programme. There has been no dissension from the view that the education and health services must be maintained unimpaired. There is also general agreement, I believe, that the destitute must be adequately helped. Only when those services have been financed could there be any possibility of resuming a general distribution of food rations, and members favouring such a step should be aware that this would add at least a further \$25 million to the Agency's annual requirements.

(Mr. Rydbeck)

I have also noted the request from a number of representatives for the transfer of the Agency's headquarters. I wish to reaffirm my intention to comply with the terms of General Assembly resolution 37/120 K, which calls for the relocation of the headquarters "to its former site within its area of operations as soon as practicable".

Finally, the Lebanese delegation here outlined a programme for co-operation with UNRWA in Lebanon and I just want to reaffirm the position of the Agency from the very beginning of our operation in Lebanon; that we undertake nothing that is not done in close co-operation with the Lebanese Government.

Among the many statements we have heard during the course of this debate, there have been a number of criticisms addressed to UNRWA from different quarters. My perception of those criticisms is that they relate, for the most part, to political considerations. To the extent that they concern specific factual questions, I shall be only too happy to discuss them with any delegation that wishes to do so. I am, of course, fully aware of the political link between the Palestine issue as a whole and the creation and operation of UNRWA and of the political role, positive and important, that the Agency plays through its mere existence in the Middle East. However, it is no part of the role of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA to participate in the political debate in this Committee and I therefore refrain from answering any of the specific criticisms that have been uttered and that have stemmed mostly from political considerations.

I only wish to assure Members that my annual report to the General Assembly is written with one object only: to inform the Assembly of the activities and policies of the Agency and any problems it encounters in its efforts to implement in the most effective way possible the mandate entrusted to it. With your support, this is the policy I shall continue to pursue.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who have requested to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): Mr. Chairman, I hope I would not open up a procedural debate if I were formally to request that the very important remarks which the Commissioner-General has just made be reproduced in extenso in the records of the Committee. I do this because he is the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, his declarations are extremely pertinent to the work, to affording us the

(Mr. Chammas, Lebanon)

opportunity of appraising effectively the work in the light of his views and remarks, and there is no text of those remarks distributed and I could see that he was speaking from written notes and I think they concern all Governments, in particular the host Governments and the contributing Governments. On the usual understanding that if my request opens no other debate and raises no objections, I request that you, Sir, before we proceed any further, rule on this formal request that I have made.

The CHAIRMAN: Representatives have heard the proposal submitted by the representative of Lebanon. May I take it that the Committee agrees to the reproduction of the closing remarks of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA in extenso in our summary records?

It was so decided.

Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): Before speaking in exercise of the right of reply, I wish, at the outset, to thank the Commissioner-General for his remarks and observations. We took note with satisfaction of the direct reference he has made to Lebanon and, as we did in our statement in the general debate, we wish to reiterate at this stage our readiness at all times and under all circumstances and within our capacity to collaborate with him and with his staff in order to help him discharge the tremendous task which has been and is being entrusted to him by the General Assembly.

We took note too of the fact that he spoke now of only five detainees in Lebanon and we want to assure him again, as we did yesterday, that the Lebanese authorities will be ready at all times to talk to a representative of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA about the reasons for which they have been detained, assuring him again and the members of the Committee of our continued strict observance of our obligations under all the conventions concerning immunities and privileges, in particular the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, as we are one of the few countries that so often have recourse, for assistance and help, to this important Organization, which we hope will one day regain its role.

The delegation of Lebanon does not usually request to speak in exercise of the right of reply because it draws satisfaction or pleasure from that fact. This, to our mind, is a course of last resort which we take if we feel compelled, and today, like yesterday, this was an instance where I think we found ourselves in that

(Mr. Chammas, Lebanon)

predicament. I had anticipated yesterday - and rightly so - and had cautioned that we did not want the situation in Lebanon to become a subject of debate in this Committee. We had to rewrite our policy statement in the light of the debate at the last minute and had to gauge the political aspects of it in so far as they relate to the item under consideration.

I know, I understand and I accept the right of the Israeli representative to choose the style he deems fit. I do not question that. I, as a matter of fact, would welcome any recourse he thinks best serves his interest. But I would have hoped that he would have been careful not to inject certain aspects, which he went through quickly but which are of such grave nature that if put under scrutiny they would give the wrong impression of what the Lebanese tragedy is all about, and I will not digress, as he did, from the overall picture. From the minute he read out his first quotation, relating to the report of the Secretary-General, I knew exactly where it was leading us. In order not to take up much time, I shall just reply, very specifically, to certain points which directly touch the Lebanese people and the Lebanese situation and I shall make the direct, brief, following quotations.

"A protracted civil war, a religious/ethnic strife" - those are the descriptions at the beginning of his statement. Does the representative of Israel in his thorough study of the history of Lebanon and its people really believe that in essence the Lebanese tragedy could be summed up in the descriptions he gave?

If one reads through his statement - we have not read through it; we have listened to it - he went on to refute these basic facts when he brought up elements which would have proved that what is going on in Lebanon is a war inside Lebanon by forces from outside Lebanon. If the war in Lebanon is a civil war, may I ask the representative of Israel why the Israeli forces are still in southern Lebanon? May I ask him why the non-Lebanese forces, whoever they are, are still in Lebanon? Are they all there because it is a "civil war"?

We do not ask for pity; it is not in our tradition. We ask for understanding and we demand compassion from all those who address themselves to the tragedy of Lebanon. To be honest, the representative of Israel does not have a monopoly on that, because other delegations, in good faith no doubt, have referred to the situation in Lebanon as a situation of civil strife. Of course in Lebanon we have our differences and they are deep differences. They have religious connotations,

(Mr. Chammas, Lebanon)

but we have been caught in the cobweb of a power struggle of a global nature in a regional context and in local wars that are being fought, sometimes regretfully, with Lebanese means. We have allowed ourselves to be victimized, but we are determined to save ourselves. What we request and what we demand of others is that they discharge their obligations in assisting us to find peace and tranquillity within our own country.

It is not my intention - I have no prepared remarks before me - to fall into the trap of injecting the Lebanese equation into the debate on the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, but there are certain pronouncements that are so grave that if they are not dealt with immediately and explained without delay they may lead people to the wrong impression.

In our history we have had our problems. Which country does not have internal problems? We sometimes do kill one another, but we are not students of mass murder. This has not been part of our history. Study the last four centuries; study the four centuries of Ottoman rule and see how we stood fast seeking and fighting for our autonomy. We are not newcomers to the body politic of the Middle East and if at times we appear as though our body politic has been impotent - and I address myself to the representative of Israel - this is not the first time in the political history of countries that a system has acquired a certain degree of impotence; we shall overcome it, and I hope that we will not become politically senile. This is something we leave to others who are more versed than we are in the art of political senility.

We as a people are determined to do whatever we can to regain a unity. We had our problems a century ago. We were able to overcome them. We do not have only coexistence in Lebanon; we have active participation. We are a mosaic of communities. There are frictions between us. Take the extraneous elements out and - I am not addressing the representative of Israel alone, I am addressing everyone in this Committee and through them the rest of the world - rest assured we can surmount our problems, because then they fall within our capacity, socio-economic, political, psychological and otherwise. We will overcome them and we will surmount them.

Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to begin my statement in exercise of the right of reply by quoting a verse from the Holy Koran:

"In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate, you who are believers, if someone comes to you with falsehoods, beware not to follow suit and spread falsehoods, else you will fall into regretfulness."

It is not usual for the Egyptian delegation, in this Committee or in others, to make allegations and spread falsehoods. The systematic approach of the Egyptian delegation has always been to present true and logical arguments, and this was the approach of the Egyptian delegation in its statement on this item. The Egyptian delegation has so many arguments and enough proof and evidence to fill not only 10 days but a whole session and I am not exaggerating when I say that the Egyptian delegation is fully prepared to present arguments, proof and evidence until doomsday to confirm our conviction of the justice of the Palestinian cause.

The representative of Israel in this Committee and in other forums frequently refers to the fact that there are peace accords with Egypt. Here I wish to clarify two points.

The first point is that Egypt's peaceful relations with the countries of the world, small or large, are equal; we will never accord any privilege or special status to any country, whether in the West or in the East. This first fact should be borne in mind by everyone.

The second fact is that the peace accords between Egypt and Israel - let there be no illusion, doubt, false aspirations or misjudgements; I say this aloud with all honesty and clarity - do not give Israel carte blanche to pursue policies of aggression or invasion; they are never to be interpreted as authorization for Israel to wage its expansionist policy in the area.

Egypt opened the door wide for Israel to abandon aggression, occupation and prejudice. Regrettably, however, Israel is still a prisoner of its imagination-and-myth-filled past and is continuing to slam the door to peace - the door that was opened to it by the largest Arab country in the area.

The second point concerns the situation of the refugees in Gaza and Rafah - Egyptian Rafah. The Egyptian statement made this question clear and the representative of Israel referred to the practical proposals made to Egypt.

Allow me to clarify those practical proposals to solve the problem of Gaza and Egyptian Rafah. It was proposed to Egypt that it should exchange a piece of land from Egypt for a piece of land from Palestine - that is, that Egypt should take



(Mr. Shehata, Egypt)

Palestinian Rafah and Israel would take part of Egyptian territory in exchange. These are the practical proposals submitted to Egypt to deal with the subject of border definition. I think it is incredible to think that we would relinquish any part of Egypt or wrongfully annex any part of Palestine or of any other country.

Thirdly, the facts contained in the Egyptian statement on the Ansar camp and the livelihood of the refugees were described by the Israeli representative as the result of ignorance of the facts. However, I believe that the Israeli representative has a very good memory, but just in case he does not, I am prepared to relate some of the facts contained in the Egyptian statement once again. In the Egyptian statement we quoted the views of Yuri Avneri, a well-known personality within and outside Israel. He visited Ansar camp and he said it was a cancer in our body, a stain that should be wiped out. These are not the words of the Egyptian delegation; these are the words of a well-known Israeli personality. It may be that they are allegations. However, they are facts witnessed by a certain well-known person. There also exists a medical report submitted by three Jewish doctors from the United Kingdom - a pediatrician, a surgeon and a biologist - who have visited the camp and say that they did not see any men there. Where are the men? Where is the human force in Ansar?

I believe that neither Yuri Avneri nor the three Jewish doctors from the United Kingdom nor Arie Eliav, who wrote in The New York Times about the painful surgery of repartitioning greater Israel, can be exaggerating.

Finally, I can only tell the representative of Israel that he should acquaint himself with the painful realities and facts. Those facts will be submitted next week, God willing, with regard to the Israeli practices and I hope that I will then hear a much more convincing reply than the one we heard today. Next week is not too far off.

With regard to the role of Abdel Nasser in the 1969 agreement referred to by the Israeli representative and the "manoeuvres" of the Egyptians and their "megalomania", I say that the 1969 agreement on Lebanon was drawn up at the request of the legal authorities of Lebanon, and the representative of Lebanon is present here and can correct me if I am mistaken. As for infiltrators and terrorists in the Gaza Strip, I wish to remind the Israeli representative of history - as a matter of fact, I am a student of history - of the Lavon Affair in 1954. Does he

(Mr. Shehata, Egypt)

recall that scandal when infiltrators were sent to blow up the United States Consulate in Alexandria? It was a political scandal and many historical books exist on it. Its purpose was to disrupt the developing relations between Egypt and the United States.

I shall make one final remark with regard to terror and terrorists. Allow me, as a student of history, to say I know that the Maquis - the French resistance fighters during the Second World War - were called terrorists by the German occupying forces; the representative of France is here and can explain to us whether the Maquis were terrorists or freedom fighters. In addition, during the Second World War, the British Government used to call some of the present Israeli officials terrorists. Therefore the question is a relative one; it depends on the angle from which terrorists or freedom fighters are viewed. The concept of terrorism is a changing and dynamic one and should be put in its proper legal, historical and political context. Terrorism is one thing; freedom fighting is something else; legitimate struggle is something else. Egypt has so many documents and so much proof; the reading of history is a hobby of the Egyptian delegation.

Mr. AZZANI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The Israeli representative in his statement this morning mentioned Democratic Yemen. We are aware of his intention in diverting the attention of the international community and the Committee from the Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories which have led to an increase in the number of Palestinian refugees as a result of their expulsion from their lands and the expropriation of their property. We should like to emphasize on this occasion the constant position of Democratic Yemen: the aggressor, Israel, must bear full responsibility for its aggression and for the occupation of Palestinian Arab territories. The international community must take the necessary measures to put an end to the Israeli occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories. That is the basic solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees.

Mr. NAZARI (Islamic Republic of Iran): In reiterating the deep sympathy of the Islamic Revolution with the Palestine Revolution, my delegation deems it necessary to state its views and observations regarding item 73 of our agenda. Our interest is based on the following: First, the question of Palestine as an explosive issue has the potential of severely threatening peace all over the world. Undoubtedly the grave violations of the United Nations Charter and the

(Mr. Nazari, Islamic Republic  
of Iran)

denial by the illegitimate Zionist entity of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are the main causes for the existing dangerous situation in the Middle East. Secondly, we consider the struggle of the Palestinians as an integral part of the Islamic struggle against the Zionist colonization of a segment of Islamic lands in Palestine which has led to the present intolerable conditions from which our brothers are suffering.

Unfortunately, despite the continued struggle of the Palestinians to free their homeland from foreign domination and to regain their inalienable rights, efforts have been exerted through international means to give the Palestinian refugee situation a permanent status. The history of Palestine is not simply a history of refugees; it is a history of their just struggle against Zionism and racism and for human dignity.

We share the idea expressed by the representative of India in her speech that "the services provided by UNRWA can be no substitute for the Palestinian people's right to live in freedom and dignity in their own national homeland". We also believe that UNRWA should not become an agency functioning within a framework of charity that might eventually extinguish the urge of the Palestinian people to struggle against Zionism. It is unfortunate that some States, which are responsible for the unacceptable conditions in which Palestinian refugees are living, should attempt to use their contributions to UNRWA as a means of clearing their conscience of the burden of guilt. For example, not everyone in this hall remembers the massacres in Sabra and Shatila as well as other crimes committed by the Zionist entity against Palestinian civilians. Still, we note that the Zionist entity has contributed a considerable amount to the budget of UNRWA.

Today the people of Iran are acting as host to over 3 million refugees consisting of over 2 million people who have been brutally forced to abandon their homes in western Iran by continued enemy air attacks against civilians, as well as to our Afghan brothers who have fled from foreign occupation in their country. We are therefore well aware of the difficulties that UNRWA may be facing in providing the facilities that it does for Palestinian refugees. The Islamic Republic of Iran considers its assistance to UNRWA as a symbolic rather than a substantive act.

(Mr. Nazari, Islamic Republic  
of Iran)

If the international community wishes to help the Palestinians effectively and permanently, it should strengthen its support for a just and durable solution to the question of Palestine so that the need for an organization such as UNRWA would be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the next speaker to exercise his right of reply, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The Israeli representative dealt in his statement this morning with a few points that have nothing to do with the issue under consideration, which is agenda item 73. My delegation will not be diverted by the representative of Israel's desire to turn this discussion into a nonsensical one. In the framework of exercising my right of reply, I find it sufficient to discuss four of the points mentioned by the representative of Israel. The detailed Israeli statement can be completely analysed, refuted and rejected. We could spend until midnight here discussing the statement.

First of all, concerning the Israeli allegations about an exchange of refugees between Arab countries and Israel, the clear facts bear witness to the fact that Jewish inhabitants of Arab States migrated to Israel, either through being misguided by Israeli propaganda or as a result of a terrorist policy followed by the Israeli intelligence, Mossad, and I refer the Israeli representative to David Hirst's book entitled The Gun and the Olive Branch, in which he proves the responsibility of Israeli intelligence in forcing the Jews of Iraq to migrate by creating a strained situation there through the bombing of temples and the assassination of some Jews to create the impression that there was some Arab hostility towards Jews. It has not been proved that any Arab States expelled those Jews or forced them to leave. Many Arab States have repeatedly declared that they welcomed the return of those Jewish emigrants to their original Arab country and homeland.

While this Committee is sure, from the discussions it has witnessed over the last 35 years and from clear and categorical evidence that the expulsion of the Palestinians was the result of a Zionist-Israeli scheme to clear Palestinian territory of its Palestinian population and to create a mono-religious Jewish State in which Jews alone have the right to full citizenship, I should like to remind the

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

Committee on this occasion that Israel frequently claims that Jews resident in many countries are in fact hostages and calls for their release. I challenge the representative of Israel on a point of logic: Are Jews hostages until they come back to their original homelands or are they citizens that have been expelled from their homelands and thus become refugees? The truth is that Israel has only resorted to an opportunist approach in which it distorts the facts in order to serve its own interests.

Secondly, the Israeli representative alleged that the Arabs who remained in Israel and the Palestinian refugees who are suffering from military occupation in the West Bank and Gaza have flourished and prospered. In his distorted logic, the representative of Israel calls upon the peoples of the world to come to the paradise of the Israeli occupation under the guidance of his racist and exclusivist State. The representative of Israel cannot deny the fact - he even admitted it in his statement - that economic conditions in Israel are not good, in fact, they are miserable. I need not point out that the inflation rate in Israel is 200 per cent, and everybody knows that Israel lives on grants and charity at the expense of taxpayers in other sovereign States.

Thirdly, as for his allegation that Israel certainly wants to solve the question of the Palestinian refugees and that the Arabs do not want this, it is enough here to say that within the framework of stupid naiveté he has not pointed out what this Israeli solution would be like. From 1948 until today, in accordance, in fact, with the report before us, Israel has shown us that its solution is through its expulsion of the refugees and the commission of genocide against them.

Indeed, the records of the United Nations testify to the Israeli crimes against the Palestinian people. The United Nations has categorically declared that the refugee problem can be solved only through recognition of the right of return for the Palestinians in accordance with resolution 194 (III), which has been underscored repeatedly in many resolutions. I need not point out that Israel was admitted to membership of the United Nations on the basis of its pledge to implement that resolution. As for the Arab States, there can be no solution to the problem of the refugees at the expense of their homeland and their right to return to their homes and lands or at the sacrifice of their national Palestinian identity.

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

Fourthly, in his statement the Israeli representative reviewed in great detail many events that occurred in Lebanon and he dealt in particular with 6 June 1982, the day on which the barbaric Israeli invasion of Lebanon started, raining great suffering, wounding and death upon many Palestinian refugees resident in that country. There is no need to remind this Committee of the horrific events of that period - they are contained in last year's report of the Commissioner-General - and I am quite sure that members of this Committee clearly remember those Israeli atrocities, which have been reported by the mass media everywhere. It seems that for the Israeli representative history begins and ends whenever he wants, according to his interests and his attempts to misguide members of the Committee. One of Israel's representatives in this Committee previously declared that the return of the Palestinian refugees to their homelands was impossible. According to him, it is impossible to turn back the clock. I ask: how is it impossible to turn back the clock 36 years while it is admissible in that region to turn the clock back 3,000 years in order to enable the Zionists to fulfil their racist myth of the "Jewish motherland"?

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. TUDROUS (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)) (interpretation from Arabic): The statement made this morning by the Zionist representative was almost as long as the history of Israeli crimes committed against the Palestinian people. However, while Israel's crimes have been consistent in their murderous and inhuman approach for the last 35 years, since these have included expulsions, expropriations, massacres and wars carried out against the Palestinian people, the statement made by the Zionist representative cannot boast of the same consistency.

The Zionist representative thought that he could substitute lengthiness for truthfulness. The statement contained a list of fabrications, in which all those mentioned, whether Palestinians or Arabs, appear as the wrongdoers, while Israel, whose actions lie at the root of the Palestinian refugee problem which we have come here to discuss, appears to be completely free of blame. Those fabrications can be interpreted as indicative of some form of political schizophrenia from which Israel has suffered for the last 36 years, since its statements are totally unrelated to its actions. It could also be interpreted as a demonstration of arrogant

(Mr. Tudrous, PLO)

disrespect for the conscience and intelligence of all present in this Committee as well as for the work of all United Nations bodies and all United Nations resolutions, an attitude reflective of a colonial mentality claiming superiority over all others. It could also be interpreted as a pathetic attempt by a criminal to put the blame for all his misdeeds on his victims while knowing that his interpretation does not stand a chance against history, truth and justice. It is most probably a combination of all those factors.

The Zionist representative started his "historical" analysis of the problem at the point which seems to suit his purpose. He does not mention who started the series of acts of aggression in a once peaceful area.

It is unfortunate that those who, before 1948, were considered bands of terrorists by the West are today leading one of the most powerful armies with the most technologically developed weapons. Not only has Israel driven the Palestinians from their homes and expropriated their lands through what should be termed the biggest land robbery of the twentieth century, but this monstrous war machine follows the refugees to their refugee camps, killing innocent women and children in the areas in which they have sought refuge. Of course the Zionist representative concentrates in his dissertation on the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon and has the audacity to claim that his country is today the benefactor of the Palestinian refugees in southern Lebanon, without mentioning who has destroyed their homes, killed them and erected the biggest concentration camp in modern history.

He does not speak of the fate of the refugee camps in the occupied West Bank, where the Palestinians are subjected to all kinds of restrictions. Only a few days ago, five armed men dressed as civilians entered the Dheisheh camp, which has had a curfew imposed on it, and shot three Palestinians.

It is important to note that the Israeli authorities are now referring to the 1 million Palestinians in the West Bank as a threat to Israel's security, and this, of course, in preparation for new expulsions and massacres. It is ridiculous to see the representative of the most murderous army in the area coming to speak against children who find no way of resisting Israeli occupation except by throwing stones.

It is an insult to the world conscience that those who perpetrated the greatest injustice against the Palestinian people have the arrogance to pretend

(Mr. Tudrous, PLO)

that the meticulously documented information in the Commissioner-General's report (A/38/13) is unbalanced and biased, without having the intellectual honesty to point out where the information was false. It is obvious that Israel behaves with total disregard for UNRWA and its mandate. This is reflected not only by the Zionist representative's rejection of the report, but also by the information contained in the report of the Commissioner-General, which brings to light several facts about Israel's arrest of UNRWA employees and its occupation of UNRWA facilities, contrary to all international norms and values.

As for the representatives of the United States and Norway, I cannot explain their admiration for a text which is a piece of false, political propaganda and in total contradiction to the history of the area, except insofar as it is a reflection of a total lack of knowledge of what has really happened in the Middle East. If it is misinformation, it might be due to the geographical distance between the Middle East and the United States. But if that is the case, then I think that the United States should be the first to allow the United Nations and its committees to disseminate information on the question of Palestine with the aim of enlightening those who are ignorant of the true facts.

I shall conclude by reminding everyone that the strategy of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) is based simply on the return of all refugees to their villages and towns of origin and the need for the Palestinians to exercise their right of self-determination and their right to establish their own State on their own national soil, thus putting an end to the plight of the Palestinian refugees and bringing a lasting peace to that war-tormented area.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, I trust that I will not be held too strictly to the 10-minute limit for statements in exercise of reply in view of the lengthy statement made this morning by the representative of the racist Zionists and in view of the fact that you called upon the Iranian representative this afternoon ...

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): If by his opening words the representative of Iraq is begging us to be indulgent in his continuation beyond the 10 minutes then he could have at least started out in a good way by calling my country by its proper name. My country's name is the State of Israel. It is not what he says it is, just as his country is not the "Takriti entity" or whatever else.



The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The statement by the Israeli representative on a point of order is clearly an attempt to impose a new approach to the procedures in this Committee. If he really has a point of order, let him give us the number of the rule of procedure. There is nothing in the rules of procedure to prevent any State from using the statements and expressions it wishes in describing a specific situation. The delegation of any country can use expressions it finds appropriate. This is a political forum in which there are different points of view. We categorically reject any imposition on us by the representative of Israel of procedures that are not included in the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on a point of order.

Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to add to what had been stated by the representative of Syria concerning the fact that there is nothing in the rules of procedure concerning the addressing of speakers. The representative of the Zionist entity would like to have his country referred to by the title used by the United Nations. But does the Zionist entity respect United Nations resolutions enough to ask other States to use the name in accordance with the rules of the United Nations? Since the establishment of the Organization the representative of the Zionist entity has continually disregarded United Nations resolutions, even the resolution concerning the admittance of the Zionist entity as a Member of this international Organization.

We do not recognize this entity, which disregards the United Nations and flouts its resolutions and has used the point of order more than once. We reject its repeated use of the point of order in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN: I call again on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): With all due respect to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, I must say that a point of order is a point of order. It is not a departure into the high atmospheric of political propaganda. If he has a point of order, he can make a point of order, but he should call my State by its proper name, under which it was accepted into the United Nations, and this is the proper procedure followed in the Security Council and in the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to point out that the 10-minute limit on the first exercise of the right of reply during a meeting is a rather strict rule. I do not intend to impose it too strictly for a few minutes more than that and to interrupt a speaker. However, with all due respect, there is a limit on rights of reply and unfortunately, perhaps, there is no limit on statements made during the debate.

I call on the representative of Iraq to speak on a point of order and I beg him to keep the aforementioned in mind.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I wish first to reply to the point of order raised by the representative of the Zionist entity by which he diverted the Committee from the continuation of its work and I hope that this will not be included as part of the 10-minute limitation.

I am not raising a new issue; it has been previously raised in the plenary of the General Assembly on 4 November when I asked the President to make a statement to clarify that the United Nations recognizes no such State as Israel claims for itself. It recognizes neither the boundaries Israel claims for itself, which include territories not belonging to it, nor the capital it claims for itself. I have pointed out the following too: I have said that this was an aberration; there is no other State in the United Nations that resembles what Israel now calls itself. The same matter was raised the other day; before Mr. Herzog addressed the plenary General Assembly I raised the same question, and the President of the Assembly said that the Israel that the United Nations recognized and admitted to the United Nations is not the Israel that the Zionists claim for themselves today. So every delegation here has in fact the right to refer to it as an entity because neither its boundaries as defined nor its capital as claimed are accepted and recognized by the United Nations. It is unlike any other Member in this Organization.

Returning to the right of reply ...

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): We are fully appreciative of our being reminded of the brilliant questions -

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order -

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the representative of Israel. I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): What he intended to present as a point of order, Mr. Chairman, turned out in fact not to be a point of order. He is explaining and replying. Let him exercise his right of reply later.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Israel on a point of order, but I ask him to confine himself to the procedure governing statements on points of order.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I am confining myself to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that Israel, as a Member of the United Nations, is to be called by its proper name as accepted in the United Nations. What the representative of Iraq said was that he asked several questions of the United Nations General Assembly. He did not say what the ruling of the President of the Assembly was. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule on that subject now.

The CHAIRMAN: Rather than make a ruling, I will express the opinion that, generally speaking, countries are addressed in the way in which they are known as States Members of the United Nations. However, there are certainly numerous cases in the course of various debates held in the United Nations in which countries have not been addressed by their proper name, and I presume that such a country then has every right to raise a point of order.

However, in the absence of an absolutely universal practice in all cases it is rather difficult to force any representative not using the proper name of a Member country of the United Nations to do so during debate. As I said, the representative of that country then certainly has a right to protest.

With that in mind, I call upon representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The following quotation is relevant to the point we have just been discussing as well as to the agenda item now before us. It reads as follows:

"The new Government established by Menachem Begin in 1977 could proclaim the whole area of the land of Israel as an integral part of Israel's patrimony, thus closing the door on an Arab destiny for the 1.3 million Arabs who are the kernel and essence of the Palestine people, recognized in the Camp David agreements as the decisive factor in determining the permanent status of the West Bank and Gaza. Not a single country in the world community, including those most in favour of Israel, was prepared to support the idea that Israel's security required the imposition of permanent Israeli

(Mr. Zahawie, Iraq)

jurisdiction over a foreign nation. At least half the Israeli nation opposed the idea of incorporation of the population of the West Bank and Gaza into Israel. There does not exist on the surface of the inhabited globe a single State that resembles what Israel would look like if it were to incorporate the West Bank and Gaza coercively into Israel."

These words are by Abba Eban in a book published only a couple of months ago entitled The New Diplomacy: International Affairs in the Modern Age, and published by Random House, New York, 1983.

This is the crux of the question before us. But the Israeli delegation here, the Zionist delegation, would have us believe that the question of Palestine is one of the phoniest issues in modern historic and political history. This is what Mr. Blum wrote in an article entitled "Israel, the United Nations and Middle East Peace," published in The Middle East Focus of September 1980. He contends:

"We are being told day in day out that the Palestinian Arabs are a nation deprived of self-determination, sovereignty and national independence - a homeless people."

In their view, of course, as the statement today wished to make us believe, such things as refugees should not exist; they should be swept under the carpet of any neighbouring Arab country and the Zionists should have the whole of the land of Israel, the so-called Eretz Israel, that is, the occupied West Bank, Gaza and what they refer to as Judea and Samaria. All of that should be left to the Zionists and then we shall have peace as they want to have it.

I shall not go into the details of all the lies that were repeated today ad nauseam. I have refuted those lies over and over again. I refer specifically to documents A/SPC/36/PV.25 containing my statement in extenso at that session and to document A/SPC/37/PV.32. All the allegations made today were refuted by my delegation, and I would refer representatives to those two documents for further reference.

I would, however, like to touch upon a few points raised by the Israeli representative today. He contended that from July 1981 to June 1982, under cover of a ceasefire, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) pursued its acts of terror, et cetera, et cetera, and that that is why Israel was forced to launch "Operation Peace for Galilee". He stated that those are well-known facts. The facts are - and this has been reported in the international press - there had not

(Mr. Zahawie, Iraq)

been one single shot fired since that ceasefire was arranged by Mr. Habib. Mr. Eban, the former Israeli Foreign Minister believes that the Government should never have embarked on the operation. He says:

"Israel's security situation was satisfactory. Galilee had been quiet for the past year. The art of war is to know when to stop."

That statement was published in The New York Times on Sunday, 27 June 1982.

The representative of Israel contended that the PLO was giving assistance to international terrorists. On 4 June 1983 the International Herald Tribune published the following:

"Italy, says Israel, was offered PLO radicals' arms. The Red Brigades got shipments of arms from Palestinians in 1978 but refused in 1974 an Israel offer. ... The report of an Israeli attempt to establish a link with the Red Brigades in 1974 was based on the assertion by the Red Brigades that almost all its leaders know of an attempt by the Israeli secret services to make contact with the organization through a Milan lawyer who offered arms and money. The report suggested the Israelis felt that instability in Italy, a Mediterranean ally, would prompt the United States to commit itself more heavily to Israel."

This is very pertinent. The article goes on to say:

"Israel's offer was reportedly rejected because of fear among members of the Red Brigades of manipulation by foreign secret services."

The representative who spoke this morning accused the Palestinian refugees or what he called the terrorist PLO representatives - of a policy of hiding behind the skirts of women. Now, I would like to quote the following from

Mr. Jacobo Timerman's excellent book, The Longest War: Israel in Lebanon, in which he stated:

"In 1947 the terrorist Menachem Begin blew up the British Officer's Club, killing 13 persons. Begin's terrorists hid among the civilians of Tel Aviv. The city was sealed off for five days and the entry of supplies was forbidden, but water and electricity were not suspended. Begin's terrorists cached their weapons and grenades in schools, synagogues, under the beds of children. When a British patrol arrived unexpectedly at the home of a friend of mine who was a member of a terrorist group, he hid his pistol under the skirt of his aged grandmother."

(Mr. Zahawie, Iraq)

The exact crimes for which the Zionists themselves are responsible, therefore, are the ones they try to blame on others, the very things they accuse others of doing.

He spoke today of medical help offered to the Palestinians. That reminds me of a programme that was broadcast by the American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) here in New York about a year and a half ago on "20/20". It was entitled "Under the Israeli Thumb". Any patient requiring anything more than the fixing of a fractured bone or an appendectomy was transferred by the Israelis from the occupied Palestinian territories to be treated in Jerusalem. This, as the programme brought out, was in order that the Zionists could destroy the infrastructure of the occupied territories in order to make the inhabitants totally dependent on Zionist largesse. That is the kind of medical help being offered to the Palestinians.

Let us look at all the talk about quiet and security in territories occupied by the Zionists. "Israeli troops beat up Palestinians." That is from The Guardian of 5 January 1981. "Soldiers ordered to beat up Palestinian residents" - again The Guardian, 29 December 1982. "Beatings ordered by Eitan." That is from The Times of London, 20 January 1983.

"Ex-officer cites Sharon to defend beatings.

"A military court in Tel Aviv heard yesterday that when Mr. Ariel Sharon, the Israeli Defense Minister, was asked by army officers what should be done with Arab rioters in the occupied West Bank he replied 'Cut off their testicles.'

"The testimony was introduced by Major David Moufak, a paratroop officer court-martialled on charges of brutalities towards West Bank Arabs.

Major Moufak was deputy commander of the Israeli forces in the Hebron area."

From The Observer of 6 March 1983 I quote the following: "Vigilantes in West Bank terror raids". Here is another article entitled "Death in Ansar Camp Prison, an Israeli soldier's testimony," written up without commentary by Ahron Denknar and published in Ha'aretz on 5 September 1982. "Torture allegations," in the report of Amnesty International notes that the organization had received eyewitness accounts of ill treatment of prisoners captured by Israeli forces. These allegations have come from a number of foreign medical personnel who had been working in southern Lebanon and who were arrested by the Israeli forces during the first weeks of the invasion and released after questioning. The most serious allegations refer to the detention centre at the school in Saida and describe how large numbers of prisoners

(Mr. Zahawie, Iraq)

who were forced to sit out of doors with their hands tied behind their backs were subjected to arbitrary and continual beatings all over the body with wooden batons, plastic hoses, thick ropes and other instruments, and so on and so on.

Again, the Israeli representative today repeated the lies of poor little newborn Israel being invaded by Arab armies. This has been refuted in the documents to which I have referred containing my earlier statements in this Committee. Again, to refresh his memory, they claim that all the wars were waged by the Arabs against the Israelis, and not only the 1948 war. In an article published on 20 August 1982 in The Jerusalem Post Menachem Begin stated:

"In June 1967 we again had a choice. The Egyptian army concentration in the Sinai approaches do not prove that Nasser was really about to attack us.

We must be honest with ourselves. We decided to attack him."

That is the truth. Interestingly enough, Mr. John Redaway, a former Deputy Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) wrote a pamphlet entitled Israel and Nuremberg: are Israel's leaders guilty of war crimes? A preliminary study. It is highly recommended reading and I would suggest we refer to it. It was published by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Finally, concerning the peace the Israeli representative wants I would like only to refer to The New York Times of 18 January 1983, which stated that Carter and Ford criticized the Israelis.

"Former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford contend that the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by the Israeli Government of Prime Minister Begin is the major obstacle to any moderate Arab initiatives for peace in the Middle East."

They say that Israel has been shown not to be living up to its commitments under the Camp David Agreements and that it has shown little inclination to grant any real alternatives to the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip areas. They stated that Israel had continued to confiscate properties and occupy territories and to build settlements as if to create a de facto Israeli ascendancy there. Israel has publicly repudiated the Reagan peace plan, which calls for a freeze on Israeli settlements.

"This has caused both of us a sense of deep disappointment and a sense of great concern that is shared by many other stalwart supporters of Israel."

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The statement of the representative of Israel before this Committee this morning included a campaign of misguided propaganda related to Palestinian refugees and to their problems. He tried to speak in detail about the events and the military conflicts and to depict the Palestinian people and refugees as an alien people in the region who had come only to attack Israel and commit aggression against it.

Who are these Palestinians? Where did they come from? They are a people expelled by Israel from their homeland, Palestine. The refugees are victims of Israeli aggression. My delegation is fully convinced that the statements of the Israeli representatives will not find credence with the members of this Committee, who have wide knowledge of the facts and the factors that lie at the roots of the Palestinian question.

The representative of Israel dealt with my country in his statements, alleging that Jordan perpetrated a massacre against the Palestinian refugees in 1970. That allegation is false. Jordan has received the Palestinian refugees expelled by Israel from their homeland in 1948 and in 1967 as well. Jordan has also, within its limited resources and potential, provided and will continue to provide all the support and assistance possible to the Palestinian refugees and displaced persons and to afford them opportunities to work and to earn their livelihood until they return to their homeland, Palestine.

The representative of Israel accused the Arab States of not wanting to solve the Palestinian refugee problem and of not trying to absorb the Palestinian refugees. I would like to emphasize here that the question of the Palestinian refugees is a Palestinian question and that it concerns that people, expelled from its homeland in Palestine. It is not a Lebanese or a Syrian or an Egyptian or an Arab question. The Arab peoples and countries are not obliged to pay the price of Israeli aggression. The solution of this question must therefore be a Palestinian solution, on Palestinian soil.

We would like to reiterate once again that the ultimate solution of this question lies in the implementation by Israel of all relevant United Nations resolutions relating to the Palestinian question.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply.



Mr. LEVIN (Israel): There have been quite a few rights of reply to which I shall try to address myself very briefly. There was the right of reply of the representative of Syria, to which I shall say this: he asked me if the Palestinians have prospered. I will tell him what I read this morning. I said that the Palestinian Arabs who remained in Israel have prospered. That is the truth. The Palestinian refugees in camps in Judea and Samaria have had a period of development unparalleled in the Arab countries if we measure incomes not by the price of oil but by the efforts of the Governments involved and the real progress achieved. The conclusion is this: the Palestinians have prospered in Israel; the Palestinian refugees who live in camps have had an unparalleled period of development.

"Is it paradise?" he asked. No, it is not paradise. Of course it is not paradise; we never claimed it was. On the other hand, it is certainly not the hell of the prisons in Palmyra or the massacres in Hama. There is no inflation. The Palestinians have had a very good period after 1967, and we shall show that in detail in a few days when we talk about the situation in that area.

I was surprised at the representative of Syria's speaking of genocide. On the question of genocide, I think the representative of Syria should have exercised greater caution. After all, all of us know what happened in Hama and the tens of thousands of people who were killed there and for what reason they were killed. We know what is happening today in the north of Lebanon near Tripola, in Nahr al-Bared and Bedawi, and it is rumoured that the Government of Syria has at least some connection with that. So the question of genocide should really have been put aside by the gentleman in question.

As to the barbaric invasions and atrocities in Lebanon of Palestinian refugees, I suggest the Syrian representative should look more closely at our statement. I am sure he will have enough to intrigue him for some time if he is not already well versed in his own country's role in Lebanon.

With regard to the statement made by the representative of Iraq in exercise of his right of reply, I notice that he is a scholar. He has quoted a number of books and articles. The trouble with his quotations is that there was a long series of non sequiturs and contradictions. Things did not follow in proper order. He said something about Mr. Begin having made a statement on the first day of his assumption of his post, but what Mr. Begin said on the day he was elected was that he extended his hand in friendship to all of the Arab countries. But he said

(Mr. Levin, Israel)

something about Judea and Samaria, and I must correct him and beg his forgiveness, but Judea and Samaria have not been annexed to Israel. Maybe that is news to him, but that is a fact.

As to the Red Brigades, he went on about some sort of negotiations that occurred or did not occur - I do not know - many years ago. But the fact is, and here again there was a non sequitur, he himself quoted from the newspaper that the Red Brigades received arms from the PLO. Were they not afraid of being manipulated by the PLO? Maybe. But their having received arms is a fact.

Then there was a complaint about medical help. He said the kind of medical help we gave in Lebanon was the kind of medical help we gave in Jerusalem because we did not want to give it someplace else, in Judea and Samaria. What is wrong with giving medical help in Jerusalem? There is nothing wrong with giving medical help in Jerusalem. I think many hundreds of thousands of people can attest to that. And even medical help in Judea and Samaria is excellent, and I recommend him to look deeper into that on another occasion.

He also mentioned, curiously, the reports of Amnesty International. Now, that is certainly very interesting. The Amnesty reports are replete, year in and year out, with evidence of the use of torture to extract confessions from political prisoners. Indeed, the Amnesty report said, in Iraq -

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The point of order is the fact that we are considering the question of the refugees, not prisoners, in Iraq or in any other country. This is the agenda item we are discussing, and the rules of procedure say that when a speaker does not speak to the agenda item he should be called to order.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the complexity of the situation in the Middle East, it is perhaps one of the questions that is hardest to keep confined within the limits of that aspect only. I would, nevertheless, ask the representative of Israel to keep as closely as possible to the subject of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I do apologize to the representative of Iraq. I should not talk about torture in Iraq.

There is one final thing I feel compelled to say regarding the statement of my dear colleague, the representative of Egypt. He said that his delegation has a hobby of the study of history. That is certainly welcome. I am sure that in his

(Mr. Levin, Israel)

studies of history he has had enough time to read the voluminous reports of the period under Gamal Abdul Nasser - the war in Yemen, for instance, that cost 250,000 casualties, the attempt to take over Syria, from whence they were thrown out. I am certain that if he is interested in history he can keep himself very busy, perhaps not until the Day of Judgement, as he said, but certainly for a thousand and one nights.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon representatives who wish to speak a second time in exercise of their right of reply, and I would remind them that they have five minutes in which to make their statements.

Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I did not quote Mr. Begin concerning the annexation of the West Bank occupied territories. I quoted him on Israel's decision to attack Nasser.

My quotation on the annexation was what Mr. Eban had said concerning the new Government established by Menachem Begin, which incorporated the occupied territories. Of course, in his view the territories are not being annexed, the Zionists believe that these territories have been liberated, and this is the problem.

To come back to the question of Amnesty International, this report deals precisely with that organization's concern in south Lebanon since the Israeli forces entered the country on 6 June, and that report is dated 5 August 1982. If he wants to consider the situation of prisoners in Iraq there are other forums for that matter and it should certainly not be mixed up with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) or with south Lebanon.

Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I feel compelled once again to exercise my hobby of history in order to make another stimulating injection, if I may use that expression, that may provide food for thought after the meeting. I should like to proffer the following for the benefit of the representative of Israel: with regard to the war in Yemen, I wish to affirm that the representative of Yemen is present at this meeting. The entry of Egyptian forces into Yemen was at the request of the legal authorities of that country, and the Arab Republic of Yemen, which is still with us, was established. Egypt and the Egyptian people are proud to have assisted the fraternal people of Yemen in achieving independence and joining the international community.

(Mr. Shehata, Egypt)

As for what the Israeli representative calls Egyptian control of Syria, our friend and brother the representative of Syria is present and he can perfectly well clarify history. We all know, and the representative of Syria can confirm this, that the proposed unification of Egypt and Syria was completely voluntary on both sides and was halted in 1961 upon the decision of the Syrian Government. We shall continue on the path towards unity whenever possible.

With regard to documents that can provide further food for thought, I could quote statements by some historical Israeli personalities, Mr. Goldman, Mr. Dyan and Mr. Berger, as well as the writers Meir Zamir and Michael Curtiss. Time is limited, and I cannot cover the statements of all of those important figures. I believe, however, that the classical source of Israel's policy in south Lebanon can be found in their words. When writing about expelling and pursuing the refugees in the Gaza Strip, one writer stated:

"We shall chase them to Jordan, and even if they stay we will manage somehow."

As for the Israeli intentions in Lebanon, the autobiography of Sharett contains the famous letter written by Ben Gurion on 27 February 1954, one of the most important historic documents. He wrote:

"Lebanon is the weakest link in the Arab League. The creation of a Christian State is therefore a natural act. In normal times this would be almost impossible, but in times of confusion and revolution or civil war things take on another aspect. Without our initiative and our vigorous aid this will not be done. It seems to me that this is the central duty, or at least one of the central duties, of our foreign policy. This means that energy and means ought to be invested in it, and that we must act in every possible way to bring about a radical change in Lebanon."

Then Ben Gurion explained his 1954 plan for taking measures against Lebanon and submitted it to the high officials in the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, and in so doing he made a vigorous statement. Sharett states that on 28 May 1954 - I quote from page 1,024:

"The only thing that is necessary is to find an officer, even just a major. We should either win his heart or buy him with money to make him agree to declare himself the saviour of the Maronite population. Then the Israeli army will enter Lebanon, will occupy the necessary territory and will create a

(Mr. Shehata, Egypt)

Christian régime which will ally itself with Israel. The territory from the Littani southward will be totally annexed to Israel and everything will be all right."

This is the scenario planned as long ago as 1954, that is, before the appearance of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and before the security threat to Israel from the north.

In a publication entitled Politics and Violence in Lebanon, a professor of Middle East history at Ben Gurion University, Meir Zamir, a man who defended the idea of establishing a Christian State in Lebanon, wrote:

"The solution lies in creating a federated State composed of Moslems and Maronites in the Lebanese mountains, composed of Shi'ites in the south, Shi'ites and Sunnis in the Bekaa Valley and north of Tripoli and, in the capital, Moslems and Christians."

Expressing an opinion completely in accordance with Ben Gurion's, Zamir states that the Christians in Lebanon today have a golden opportunity to remedy the mistakes committed 50 years ago by their forefathers. There are many historical documents that can prove all this, and I shall of course pursue my hobby of history next week in this Committee when we come to discuss the agenda item on Israeli practices.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I listened with great interest to the results of the research of our colleague, the representative of Egypt, and it was indeed interesting. However, I must quote the words of the man - I think it was Churchill - who said, "Much better to make jaw-jaw than to make war-war".

Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): In his statement in exercise of his right of reply the representative of Israel mentioned my country once again. I am determined not to deal with matters unrelated to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and the refugee problem.

With regard to the terrorist policy of the Zionists in expelling the Palestinian Arabs I wish briefly to practise my hobby of history and recall here some statements made by Zionist leaders. In 1954, in the introduction to his book on the history of the Haganah, which was published by the international Zionist organization, David Ben Gurion wrote that it was clear that England was for the English, Egypt for the Egyptians, and Judea - by which he meant Palestine - for the Jews. He wrote that in his country there was place for but one people, and that

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

was the Jewish people. The Arabs would therefore be told to leave and, if they resisted, they would be expelled by force.

Menachem Begin, the leader of the Irgun terrorist organization and former Prime Minister of Israel, in his book entitled The Revolution, boasted about the terrorist acts engaged in by the Irgun and stated that terrorism was the only effective way to achieve what he called "the national Jewish objectives" in Palestine. On 29 October 1956, on the eve of the attack on Egypt, he wrote that Israelis should not be soft when killing their enemies nor should they show pity or mercy until they had destroyed Arab culture, on the ruins of which Zionist civilization was to be built up.

General Shlomo Jonein, at the time he was chief of political propaganda for the Israeli army in 1972, explained Zionist philosophy, saying:

"It is important for me that the Jewish people remain alive; I do not care if other peoples continue to live or not."

Of course he was referring to the Palestinian people and to the Arab nation.

In the early days of Israel Ben Gurion had stated to Jewish students that the establishment of the State of Israel was only the beginning and that the map as it then existed was not the Zionist map. There was another map, he told them, that students in Jewish schools would create and make a reality, a map on which Israel would extend from the Nile to the Euphrates. In his introduction to the Yearbook of the Government of Israel for 1952/53, Ben Gurion stated:

"We must remember that Israel was established on only a part of the land of Israel."

In the introduction to the 1955/56 Yearbook he wrote:

"The establishment of the State does in no way mean that the final objective of the historic land of Israel is being abandoned."

In August 1956 Ben Gurion stated that the population should be increased over the next five years to 4 million and that additional land must be provided. That additional land is the land whose annexation the Israeli representative has never acknowledged here because he considers it a part of the historic land of Israel given to the Jewish people by God.

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

Finally, I fully support the statement of my colleague, the representative of Egypt, who said that the union between Syria and Egypt in 1958 was willingly and freely entered into by the Egyptian and Syrian peoples. I share his hopes and aspirations that unity will be achieved once again.

Mr. ALSHAWKANI (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to reply to the statement made in right of reply by the Israeli representative. I fully support and agree with the statement made by my Egyptian colleague and I wish to recognize the generous assistance provided to Yemen by Egypt under the leadership of Gamal Abdul Nasser, which was of great importance to the Yemeni Revolution of 26 September 1968 through which the people of Yemen were able to start on the path to development. My people greatly appreciates the assistance of the people and leaders of Egypt. There is no foundation whatsoever to the allegation made by the representative of the Zionist entity.

Mr. LEVIN (Israel): I have a request and a question. My question is with regard to the publication in extenso of the Jordanian statement, which was requested by the representative of Jordan at our first meeting on this agenda item. The financial implications of that publication in extenso were not questioned at that time. May I at this time enquire what the financial implications of the publication in extenso of that statement would be?

My request is with regard to the publication in extenso of my delegation's statement this morning. I should like to request that we defer a decision on that matter to a time when, as the Chairman explained, we find ourselves meeting in a chamber with suitable electronic voting equipment, if the matter is to be put to a vote.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The Jordanian delegation did not request reproduction in extenso of the Jordanian statement. Another delegation, with the support of all other delegations, requested the reproduction of Jordan's statement in extenso out of an awareness that the Jordanian statement was replete with positive analyses and proofs relating to the question under discussion, namely, the agenda item on the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to speak to this question.

Mr. OIU (Secretary of the Committee): In accordance with the General Assembly's decision that the Special Political Committee may obtain transcripts of the whole or part of the discussions at some of its meetings, such texts are provided by the Secretariat within existing resources and do not entail any additional budgetary expenditures. The transcripts are prepared by verbatim reporters and typists from tapes and such work is done only when the staff concerned are not otherwise occupied in servicing meetings normally provided with verbatim records. Accordingly, no translation work or overtime for the regular General Assembly staff is involved.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the other point raised by the representative of Israel, I have been informed by the Secretariat that we will find ourselves in a room with electronic voting equipment on Wednesday. If any delegation wishes at that time to raise the point raised today by the representative of the United States we will then be in a position properly to take a decision on it.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.