

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records **

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Wednesday, 5 December 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic)

later: Mr. TUBMAN (Liberia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 51: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES
AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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/34/SR.42
21 December 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 51: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/34/631, A/34/694, A/34/720; A/SPC/34/7; A/SPC/34/L.19, L.20 and L.23)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 36th meeting the representative of Pakistan had introduced draft resolution A/SPC/34/L.19, sponsored by Madagascar and Pakistan, the financial implications of which appeared in a statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/SPC/34/L.20). He also drew the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/SPC/34/L.23, issued earlier in the day, which was sponsored by Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

2. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had studied with interest the report of the Special Committee (A/34/631), which was the result of a consistent effort to give the international community a clear idea of what was happening in the occupied Arab territories. Israel, by its negative attitude, was obstructing the fulfilment of the Special Committee's mandate; it had set up obstacles to prevent the sending of a mission to the occupied territories, and the Special Political Committee had recently witnessed the attack made by the representative of Israel against the Special Committee after the submission of the report.

3. The inhabitants of the occupied territories were being subjected to odious practices which were without precedent in history. Israel had established new settlements and expanded existing ones, to the detriment of the Arab population; it had continued its policy of disregarding the beliefs of the Christian and Muslim inhabitants and making Jerusalem Jewish, trying to change its geographical and demographic nature through demolitions and the establishment of a belt of Israeli settlements around the city; it had ignored the appeals of the international community calling on it to allow the Arab inhabitants to exercise the right to self-determination and the right to express their views and allow them to receive the type of education they wished and had, instead, thrown them into camps, imprisoned them, usually with no valid reason and forced them to live in deplorable conditions; it had also confiscated cultural and material property, using various arguments, such as security reasons, and recently it had even confiscated lands which were private property.

4. In an attempt to destroy the national identity of the Palestinian people, the Zionists were trying to deny the very existence of that people. Prime Minister Begin had reaffirmed the supposed right of the Jews to establish settlements in all parts of what they considered to be the land of Israel. World Zionism, which the United Nations had declared to be a form of racism, was taking on alarming dimensions.

5. The Special Political Committee had already submitted a positive draft resolution on the subject, and the General Assembly had approved it (A/RES/34/29). He urged that pressure should continue to be put on Israel in order to make it end its policy of terror and oppression and its attempts to change the character of

/...

(Mr. Al-Sayegh, United Arab Emirates)

Jerusalem and make it recognize the right of the Arab inhabitants to self-determination. The principle of the inadmissibility of the occupation of territories by force must be reaffirmed, and the resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Israel from Jerusalem and the other occupied Arab territories must be implemented.

6. Mrs. SCHADE (German Democratic Republic) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/34/631) provided ample evidence of continued attempts to change the geographic, demographic, economic and cultural characteristics of the occupied territories and their population. It also revealed new and dangerous manoeuvres aimed at reducing even further the living space of the Palestinian people - for example, the creation of "regional councils" (para. 378) aimed at co-ordinating the services and organization of Israeli settlements in various parts of the occupied territories.

7. There could be no doubt that the conclusion of imperialist separate deals had encouraged Israel to intensify its policy of aggression and colonization at a time when an ever-growing number of States were taking the position that the Palestine Liberation Organization must be recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and were demanding its participation in the negotiations on the Middle East conflict.

8. Paragraph 67 of the report quoted Israeli governmental sources as saying that it was planned, among other things, to establish new settlements on the West Bank, in the Jordan Valley, on the Golan Heights and in the Gaza Strip. Paragraph 325 stated that the military authorities had expropriated several thousand dunams of privately owned Arab land in order to expand existing Israeli settlements, to establish new ones or to carry out large infrastructure works for the establishment of new settlements. In all cases, the Military Government had claimed that those measures were needed for "security reasons"; that argument had been rejected by the Special Committee, which held that the occupying Power could not invoke such reasons in justification of any measure adopted contrary to the Fourth Geneva Convention.

9. In March 1979 the Security Council had met in response to an urgent request by Jordan. On 20 July it had adopted resolution 446 (1979), paragraph 3 of which called once more upon Israel to abide scrupulously by the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention, to rescind its previous measures and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature and affecting the demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories and, in particular, not to transfer parts of its own civilian population into those territories. Nevertheless, the occupiers were continuing to act in defiance of the United Nations Charter and in disregard of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

10. The New York Times of 25 November 1979 had reported the Mr. Begin was considering the possibility of declaring that Israel did not regard the West Bank as occupied territory and that its status had never been legally clear. That report had been corroborated in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Chairman of the Special Committee, drawing attention to information which indicated that the Government of Israel was determined to pursue its existing policy with the aim of eventually taking over the entire occupied territory.

/...

(Mrs. Schade, German Democratic Republic)

11. As could be seen from the report submitted in the summer of 1979 by the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), that Commission had had to face the same difficulties as the Special Committee because of the obstacles which Israel had put in the way of the fulfilment of its mandate. Nevertheless, the Israeli occupiers had not been able to prevent the compilation of abundant information which was summarized in paragraph 376 of the report under consideration. Paragraph 373 of the report also drew attention to the expropriations and the severe reaction they had provoked.

12. A few days ago, five Arab States had brought to the Special Political Committee's attention the action taken by the Israeli authorities against the mayor of Nablus, and the General Assembly had just adopted a draft resolution submitted by the Committee (A/RES/34/29). Fortunately, the mayor of Nablus had been permitted to resume his office without restrictions.

13. During the past 12 years, the German Democratic Republic had consistently spoken out in support of the population of the illegally occupied territories. The Israeli practices violating human rights in the occupied territories were not an isolated issue but an integral part of the Middle East problem. Her delegation therefore supported the demand by the Chairman of the Special Committee that in order to avoid further violations of human rights, the international community should increase its efforts to achieve a lasting peace in the area.

14. The German Democratic Republic had repeatedly stated its belief that the withdrawal of Israel from all Territories occupied since 1967 and the implementation of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination were still the basic prerequisites for the peace and security of all States in the Middle East. Separate agreements failing to take account of the rights of the Palestinian people not only offered no solution but even gave encouragement to the aggressor. Her country's position had been reaffirmed in the communiqué issued following the official visit of a delegation from the German Democratic Republic to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. The communiqué stated, inter alia, that it was more important than ever before to strengthen the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. Both parties had again declared their readiness to intensify their political, moral and material support for the PLO and commended the steadfastness shown by the Arab people and States in the struggle to liberate their territories.

15. Mr. AL-ARAYYED (Bahrain) said that the Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories were well known to world public opinion. Since occupying the territories, Israel had done its utmost to change the character of the Arab towns and to establish settlements for Jewish immigrants, in violation of United Nations resolutions and international conventions. The report of the Special Committee (A/34/631) showed the reality of the outrages committed by the Israeli authorities against the citizens of Palestine. Noteworthy among them had been the appropriation of Arab lands on the West Bank of the Jordan and the permission granted to Jews to acquire lands belonging to Arabs in the occupied territories, in spite of their status under the 1949 Geneva Convention as a militarily occupied

/...

(Mr. Al-Ararryed, Bahrain)

zone. The Israeli authorities had established new settlements in the territories, claiming that the settlements were on lands belonging to the State and not to individual owners, but the falsity of that claim was made apparent by the International Herald Tribune of 22 October 1979, which stated that the lands concerned belonged to Arab citizens who had paid taxes on them until 1967. In spite of what was being said, Israel's settlements policy had not changed, as could be seen in the Israeli Cabinet's resolution of 11 November 1979 in which it decided to continue that settlements policy.

16. The various reports on Israel's illegal practices mentioned not only the expropriation of lands but also the confiscation of sources of water and restrictions imposed in the educational economic and health spheres. In the matter of education, it could be noted that in West Bank schools, the Israeli Ministry of Education inspector had ordered the replacement of Jordanian syllabi and the removal of numerous textbooks on Arab history and cultural values. In the field of health, the situation was deteriorating with every passing day. Since 1967, the number of hospitals and hospital beds had diminished, there was a shortage of staff and equipment, and health services, particularly paediatric health services, were in a bad state. The infant mortality rate had risen, even according to official Israeli statistics.

17. Israeli oppression went far beyond the confiscation of lands, the installing of settlers and the expulsion of Palestinians. Many persons had been detained and tortured in the occupied territories. He mentioned the case of the Mayor of Nablus who had been detained by the occupying military authorities less than a month earlier and had been threatened with banishment from his country. The General Assembly had adopted a resolution (A/RES/34/29) calling upon the Israeli authorities to refrain from such conduct, which was an infringement of human rights, but it was common knowledge that the Israeli authorities took no heed of appeals from the international community which condemned their violations of human rights in the occupied territories.

18. In conclusion, he said that the international community should uphold justice and the law, so as to put an end to those practices in violation of human rights in the Arab territories occupied by Israel.

19. Mrs. AHMED (Bangladesh) mentioned three facts which she considered essential. In the first place, under international law occupation could at most be a temporary phenomenon, yet Israel had remained in the occupied territories a full dozen years, taking measures of a permanent nature in pursuit of a policy totally incompatible with its obligations under the Charter and as occupying Power. Its attempt to justify the occupation on security grounds was contrary to the letter and spirit of the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the Geneva Convention of 1949, in addition to numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. In the second place, the present situation was untenable because it violated the most fundamental of the Charter injunctions, which forbade the acquisition of territory by force. Lastly, as the Special Committee had repeatedly emphasized, the very fact of occupation was a fundamental violation of the human rights of the civilian population of the occupied territories.

/...

(Mrs. Ahmed, Bangladesh)

20. The measures recently adopted by the occupying Power were not even remotely related to security considerations; they were a deliberate attempt by Israel to secure in perpetuity the fruits of its aggression. As was clearly demonstrated by the Special Committee in its report, Israel's "homeland" doctrine meant that those inhabitants of the occupied territories who did not belong to the Israeli religious group were denied the exercise of any rights that did not fit the "homeland" policy, including the right of return to their homes for those inhabitants who had fled as a result of the hostilities or who had been expelled by the Israeli military authorities. A basic tool of the expansionist policy of Israel was the establishment of settlements. As had been borne out by the Commission established under Security Council resolution 446 (1979), many of the Israeli settlements had been established on privately owned land, they were intended not only for security but for gainful and permanent agricultural use, and there was a clear link between the establishment of Jewish settlers and the displacement of the Arab population. The Commission's conclusion had been that the settlements policy was causing profound and irreversible changes of a geographical and demographic nature in the territories, including Jerusalem; the Security Council had upheld the conclusion and had repeated that Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories had no legal validity and constituted a serious obstruction to achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

21. Apart from the settlements policy, there was also proof of other illegal and inhumane practices against the inhabitants of the occupied territories, among which one could cite the expulsion and transfer of Arab inhabitants, the confiscation and expropriation of Arab property, mass arrests, ill-treatment, intimidation, reprisals and torture. One recent case had been the detention of the Mayor of Nablus. But perhaps the most heinous aspect of Israel's policy was its attempts to alter the status of Jerusalem, by Judaizing and annexing the city. The attempt offended the religious sentiments of hundreds of millions of adherents of the three great faiths and had aroused moral indignation throughout the world. Israel had interfered with religious freedom and practices, had desecrated holy books, relics and places of worship, had turned mosques into synagogues and had pillaged an archaeological and cultural heritage of infinite spiritual and material value. Furthermore, the Israeli Knesset had recently approved special legislation to ensure that foreign diplomats would transfer their main offices to Jerusalem, thereby giving the final seal of approval to the conquest.

22. Bangladesh condemned Israel's continued military occupation and its systematic depriving of the Arab population of its national rights. Her country also rejected Israeli measures to Judaize and absorb the Arab territories. The international community must demand that Israel should immediately discontinue such policies and illegal practices.

23. Bangladesh was committed to the search for a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. However, it believed that if peace was to endure, it must be based on justice, and thus, on the undoing of acts that were contrary to international law, to the norms and principles embodied in the Charter and to the exercise of basic human rights. To that end, Bangladesh had consistently supported a lasting settlement which would ensure Israel's withdrawal from all the

/...

(Mrs. Ahmed, Bangladesh)

territories occupied since June 1967, the return of Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty and the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and to a State of their own.

24. Mr. Tubman (Liberia) took the Chair.

25. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) said that the basic question in the view of everyone who followed the work of the Special Committee, as reflected in its report (A/34/631), was how effective its efforts and the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions would be so long as Israel stubbornly refused to comply with those resolutions and attempted to impose by armed force the conditions it desired. It was difficult to speak of the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories without speaking of Israel's military occupation of the territories, which in itself constituted a violation of those rights. Israel's occupation had also given rise to the repressive tactics of the Israeli authorities, which were confiscating private property, establishing settlements and imposing a Jewish presence in the occupied Arab territories with a view to declaring eventually as a fait accompli that those territories were part of Israel. With the same objective, Israel was trying to force the inhabitants of the occupied territories to abandon their homes and their property in order to eradicate the reality of the existence of the Palestinian people.

26. The report of the Special Committee clearly described that situation, not only with regard to the repressive Israeli practices against the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories but also in terms of the political reasons why Israel was applying such practices. The content of the report was irrefutable, since the Israelis could not deny that, in their attempt to colonize the occupied territories, they had established more than 120 settlements using pretexts that were contradictory and illogical. Tel Aviv's argument was that a safety zone must be set up in order to prevent future acts of aggression against Israel. However, at the same time, Israeli leaders had asserted that Israel had the right to establish settlements in any part of Palestine or the occupied Arab territories, which meant, in other words, that armed Israeli occupation had been replaced by an overt policy of annexation of those Arab territories. In pursuance of that policy, the Israelis were seeking to evacuate the inhabitants of the area, confiscating their land and compelling them in various ways to abandon their homeland.

27. It was important to bear in mind recent Israeli statements to the effect that the occupation of the Arab territories in 1967 had not constituted a violation of sovereignty over that area, that no Arab State could claim the right of territorial sovereignty over what had been Palestine in 1948, at the end of the United Kingdom's mandate, and that no State had any claims of sovereignty that were better than or even equal to, Israel's claims to what had been Palestine at that time. That argument clearly reflected another attempt by the Israeli leaders to legitimize the occupation of the Arab territories. The Arab States had never claimed sovereignty over Palestine. That sovereignty had always belonged to the Palestinian people, and only Israel as denying it.

/...

(Mr. Mubarez, Yemen)

28. The Tel Aviv leaders, according to their own statements, were prepared to re-examine their policies with regard to the human rights of the population of the occupied Arab territories, but they were not prepared to recognize that population's right to those territories. They were thus denying that population the political rights which were an integral part of its human rights.

29. It was regrettable that some States used the slogan of human rights as a shield against other States; while mobilizing all their forces to defend the rights of certain limited groups, they were denying the rights of a people that was being subjected to racist domination. Israel was receiving unlimited supplies of weapons which enabled it to perpetuate its domination. That was a blatant contradiction of the concept of human rights and gave reason for serious doubts about the intentions of States which claimed to be the defenders of those rights.

30. It was surprising that some news media which claimed to be objective asserted that the population of the occupied territories was benefiting from the occupation. Those media seemed to be unaware of the repressive practices to which the inhabitants of those territories were being subjected.

31. All the peoples of the world shared responsibility for that situation. It was essential to restore the Palestinian people's sovereignty over its homeland and to reaffirm the legitimacy of its armed struggle, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which faithfully represented the interests of the Palestinian people. His delegation supported the recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee (A/34/631, sect. VI), particularly its appeal to the international community "... to assume its responsibilities to end the occupation, thereby safeguarding the most fundamental of the human rights of the population of the occupied territories" (para. 394).

32. Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria) expressed his delegation's appreciation for the report submitted by the Special Committee (A/34/631). He commended the determination and dedication of its members in preparing that report in spite of the overt hostility of the Israeli Government and the generally unco-operative attitude of the Israeli military administration in the occupied territories.

33. Since the beginning of the Israeli occupation in 1967, approximately 60,000 Israeli citizens had settled in some 100 locations. Those settlements constituted a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which stipulated that the occupying Power should not transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupied; that opinion was shared by virtually all Governments that had studied the matter, including those that maintained friendly relations with the Jewish State. The Israeli Government denied the illegality of its settlements on the ground that the Fourth Geneva Convention did not apply to its occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and that, furthermore, the Israeli settlements represented the activity of private Israeli citizens, not the organized "transfer" of population by the Israeli Government. However, it was clear that the Convention did not refer to the forcible transfer of population by the occupying Power. In addition, there was irrefutable evidence that the Israeli Government was actively involved in the establishment of the settlements. Moreover, the settlements

/...

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

appeared to be part of a deliberate policy to populate the West Bank and the Gaza Strip with Israeli citizens in order to facilitate the eventual incorporation and annexation of those areas.

34. The Israeli Government's usual reply was that the settlements had been constructed only on State land, not on privately owned property, and that they did not displace the indigenous population but rather existed in harmony with the Arab villages surrounding them. Furthermore, it claimed that the settlements brought benefits to the Palestinians who lived near them. There were many examples illustrating why his delegation regarded the systematic eviction of Palestinians as a deliberate act of colonization. In almost every location where Israeli settlements had been established, land previously cultivated by the Palestinian inhabitants had passed into the hands of the settlers. That land had been neither State property nor vacant.

35. The confiscation process was administered as if the Arab landowners had no right to the land which they had bought or inherited from their fathers, on which they had paid taxes for years and which had provided them with their livelihood. The settlements, which were initially paramilitary, soon became civilian in nature and the Palestinian inhabitants were converted into aliens or second-class citizens in their own country, or hired hands on the very lands which they had previously owned.

36. It was important, in the view of his delegation, that the settlements should be understood in terms of their legal and human rights implications. The technical arguments advanced by the Government of Israel to justify its policies were basically a diversionary tactic used to avoid a discussion of its real intentions. In that respect, the Begin Government had been more honest than its predecessors. Begin's comments on the settlements and his proposed "autonomy plan" clearly reflected the intention to secure the West Bank as an integral part of the "historic Jewish homeland". It was logically impossible to argue, as the Israeli Government did, that the settlements would not displace or adversely affect the indigenous Palestinian population. The policies motivating settlement in 1978-1979 were not unique; they were essentially the same as those employed in the 1920s and 1930s. Unfortunately, the effect was also the same: the aim of one people to return to its homeland was being exercised at the expense of another people's right to live in its homeland.

37. It was not surprising that the enormity of the pattern of Israeli administration in the occupied territories had provoked spontaneous demonstrations and resistance by the aggrieved Palestinians. Israel's response had been to increase its brutal repression, and that vicious circle could not be broken until the original causes of Palestinian discontent had been eliminated.

38. It was no longer enough simply to consider the Israeli settlements an obstacle to peace. Israel's policy of colonialist expansion must be fought by all possible means, and Israel must be forced to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions. It must have no further doubts about the determination of the United Nations to deal with it firmly if it persisted in its intransigence, and the United Nations must reaffirm the fact that all Israeli measures that altered the

/...

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

demographic structure of the occupied territories were illegal, and also reaffirm the principle that the Geneva Convention of 1949 should be applied mutatis mutandis to the occupied territories and call upon Israel to respect that Convention, to which it was a signatory.

39. His Government would steadfastly support the Palestinians in the occupied territories until every inch of their land was restored to them in dignity and honour.

40. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) thanked the Special Committee for the dedication it had shown in preparing its report (A/34/631). Israel's refusal to co-operate could not be justified on the grounds that the Committee lacked impartiality; instead, it must be assumed to stem from the fear that the Committee might expose the horrible situation prevailing in the occupied territories.

41. The report provided abundant evidence of Israel's violations of human rights, its defiance of the United Nations and its violations of the Geneva Convention. The conclusions were based on irrefutable facts. His delegation endorsed the conclusion that the Israeli Government officially planned to annex and settle the occupied territories. The fact that a special budget had been approved for the expansion of the settlements left no doubt as to the danger inherent in such plans, or of the intention of carrying them out as soon as possible.

42. Clearly, a deliberate attempt was being made to prevent the Palestinians from settling in their own homeland. There was incontrovertible proof of violations of the right to freedom of association, expression, assembly and religion, and of acts of violence and provocation, collective reprisals against the civilian population and barbaric cruelty not only on the part of the military authorities, but also on the part of the Jewish settlers. The report showed that Palestinian detainees lived in subhuman conditions and were subjected to savage torture, according to evidence given to the United States Congress and the report of Amnesty International.

43. His delegation welcomed the fact that the Special Committee had pointed out the danger represented by Israel settlement practices, especially in the Golan Heights. Since 1967, 90 per cent of the residents of that area had been forced to leave their homes so that Israel could establish settlements in accordance with its colonization policy, aimed at changing the geographical nature and demographic composition of the territories and creating a de facto situation that would delay the achievement of a just and lasting peace. Paragraphs 142 to 149 of the report listed the Israeli settlements that had already been established or were being constructed in the Golan Heights. The destruction of Quneitra, which the Israelis had perpetrated before withdrawing from that city, had been a premeditated and unprecedented crime, as could be seen from the report (A/31/218, annex III).

44. Israeli policy now included a new tactic, the tactic of putting pressure on the inhabitants remaining in the Golan Heights to leave the area or take Israeli citizenship, in preparation for the formal annexation of that area. That dangerous policy was just as serious as military aggression. The Golan Heights were an integral part of Syrian territory. Syria's commitment to freeing them was the same

/...

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

as the commitment of the Palestinian people to freeing their homeland and the commitment of the entire world to freeing Jerusalem, the holy city of three religions.

45. Israel's statements in the Committee, which were full of evasions and misrepresentations, were not surprising; however, he deplored the aspersions cast on the integrity of the Special Committee and the accusation that its conclusions had been designed to discredit Israel. It was significant that the conclusion that the occupation constituted a fundamental violation of the human rights of the civilian population of the occupied territories was disputed. According to the Definition of Aggression contained in the annex to resolution 3314 (XXIX), any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from the invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State qualified as an act of aggression (art. 3 (a)). Consequently, by persisting in its occupation of the Arab territories, Israel was committing a violation of international law. That violation was compounded by the Israeli practices in the territories, such as annexation, confiscation, destruction of dwellings, displacement and expulsion of persons, torture and other acts carried out on the pretext of security. The arguments of the Israeli representative regarding the benefits that the occupation brought to the people of the occupied territories were reminiscent of the arguments of the Nazis and the outdated philosophy of colonialism.

46. Israel's crimes included destructive acts in Lebanon, which had begun in the southern part of that country and subsequently expanded with its support to outlawed factions that had broken away from the Lebanese State. Its incursions and attacks on the peaceful inhabitants of Lebanese villages and Palestine refugee camps constituted a defiance of United Nations resolutions and of the Organization's physical presence represented by UNIFIL.

47. His country shared the Special Committee's concern over the denial of the lawful rights of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories and considered that the only means of remedying that situation was to put an end to the military occupation. However, the Zionist régime would persist in its policies and continue to ignore and defy the United Nations; repeated condemnations were no longer adequate. Since Israel was pursuing the same policies as South Africa, the United Nations must also apply to Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, so as to put an end to the military occupation of the Arab territories and enable the inhabitants to return to their homes.

48. Mr. CERGA (Albania) said that Israel would not be able to defy world public opinion were it not for the support of the United States. The United States imperialists were giving economic, political and military support to Israel because they wanted to use that State to promote their own aims in the Middle East. On the other hand Israel took advantage of the rivalry of the imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which were engaged in a competition for the redivision of the world and spared no effort to suppress the legitimate demands of the peoples of the Middle East and to deny them their freedom and independence. Soviet social imperialism, posing as friend and defender of the Palestinian people and of other Arab peoples, encouraged Israel by providing human resources that were used for cannon-fodder and for colonizing the new settlements. The demagogic fuss made by the two imperialist super-Powers about a "solution" to the Middle East

/...

(Mr. Cerga, Albania)

problem, and their feverish diplomatic campaigns, were merely an extension of their intrigues against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. The experience gained by the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their long struggle against the imperialist Zionist aggressors and the anti-Arab plots of United States imperialism and Soviet social imperialism had shown them the real way to solve their problems: a determined struggle against their various enemies.

49. The people and Government of Albania unflinchingly supported the just cause of the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples and was convinced that, in spite of the difficulties facing them, those peoples would achieve victory through their resolve and courage and by maintaining and strengthening their unity.

50. Mr. RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the various reports of the Special Committee not only showed the existence of violations of human rights in the occupied territories but also supported the PLO's contention that the occupation of those territories represented a definite stage in the implementation of the Zionist programme in Palestine. The main aim of the Zionist colonization of Palestine, both before and after the creation of the State of Israel, had been and continued to be to rid Palestine of its inhabitants and to destroy the Palestinian people as a nation and expel them from their homeland. The Zionists had not only colonized Palestine but had falsified its history and they continued to practise racial discrimination against the Palestinian people, and even against those Palestinians who were supposed to have Israeli citizenship. Israeli practices in the occupied territories could be understood only within that context.

51. The myth perpetuated by the Zionists was that Palestine was a country without a people, inhabited by bedouins who were so backward that they did not care who governed them. The Messianic role of the Zionists had been to develop that land and to transform the desert into a Garden of Eden. The fact that Palestine had been the land of the Palestinian people for thousands of years had been totally ignored.

52. The Zionists' colonizing activities were designed to destroy the national existence of the Palestinian people. As land was the geographical basis of the national existence of any people, to deprive a people of their land was to deny them the possibility of leading an independent national existence and to deprive them of their right to self-determination, a right guaranteed to all peoples under the United Nations Charter.

53. He quoted from a master plan of the World Zionist Organization for the development of settlements in Judaea and Samaria over the period 1979 to 1983. According to that plan, the settlement of the entire land of Israel was justified by security reasons and by right, and that such settlement would be carried out on the basis of a policy of mutually interrelated blocs.

54. Israel's confiscation of Palestinian lands was designed to remove any possibility of a collective existence for the Palestinian people and, at the individual level, its effects on Palestinian farmers was disastrous. They were faced with the alternative of either working in Israeli agricultural establishments or seeking employment somewhere else, away from their land. In either case, their existence as a Palestinian people would be destroyed.

/...

(Mr. Rahman, PLO)

55. The Zionist authorities were plundering the natural resources of the occupied territories and taking control of the water supply, thereby depriving the people and the land of badly needed water.

56. Israel's treatment of Palestinian political prisoners was inhuman and violated all moral and legal standards. Torture was systematic and had been condemned by numerous international organizations concerned with the protection of human rights. Paragraphs 241 to 322 of the Special Committee's report gave details of the situation of detainees.

57. According to information confirmed by the testimony of jurists who were investigating Israeli practices affecting the land and people of Palestine, insufficient legal remedies were available to the Palestinian people because Israel refused to recognize that the Fourth Geneva Convention applied to the occupied Arab territories. That attitude reflected the Israeli Government's true intentions, clearly stated by the representative of the Zionist State, of annexing those territories. It could not be argued that the world was free as long as there were peoples, such as the peoples of Palestine and South Africa, who were deprived of their fundamental human rights to self-determination and national independence, in violation of international law and the moral and legal standards of the civilized world.

58. The Israeli Zionist representative had said that the Camp David accords gave autonomy to the Palestinian people. He wished to reiterate his position with regard to those accords which purported to solve the question of Palestine without the participation of the Palestinian people, who alone had the right to decide their future, and without regard for the views of the international community. Those accords had imposed on the Palestinian people a formula which did not take account of their national and civil rights, disregarded the PLO, which represented that people, and overlooked the question of Jerusalem. Those accords even divided the Palestinian people into three parts, and attempted to deal with only one of those parts, namely the Palestinians in the Gaza and West Bank areas, completely ignoring the other Palestinians residing in the territories occupied since 1948 and those living outside the land of Palestine. The Camp David accords had enabled the Zionist Government to put a new construction on the resolutions of the Security Council, totally disregarding the principles governing the United Nations, and to pursue its settlement policies.

59. The Palestinians believed that the liberation of peoples was part of the spirit of the age, and that its object was to achieve a just peace. The Palestine Liberation Organization was proud to represent that spirit and would continue its liberation struggle for a just peace as long as part of its territory was occupied and its people were oppressed. Its right to resist occupation was recognized in numerous international conventions and, in particular, in the resolutions of the Special Committee of 24.

60. Mr. DAMDINDORJ (Mongolia) said that the Mongolian People's Republic condemned all policies of expansionism, hegemonism, aggression and annexation, including the Israeli Government's policy of annexing the Arab territories occupied in 1967, and fully agreed with the Special Committee's conclusions and particularly those contained in paragraphs 366 and 370 of its report (A/34/631).

/...

(Mr. Damdindorj, Mongolia)

61. The Israeli authorities had systematically ignored the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions urging them to be guided by the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, in their treatment of the Arab population. Recently, Israeli policy had become even harsher: new Israeli settlements had been established and existing settlements expanded, and the Arab inhabitants had been driven from their homes, and their private and communal property had been confiscated and expropriated. Those measures were fully documented in the material gathered by the Security Council Commission Established under Resolution 446 (1979). The purpose of the settlement policy was to annex the occupied Arab territories to Israel by changing their geographical nature and demographic composition.

62. The Israeli authorities were prosecuting the political and administrative leaders of the Arab population. He wished to recall the case of the Mayor of Nablus, who had received a deportation order because of his political views. That measure had been questioned even within the Israeli community. The General Assembly had urged the Israeli authorities to rescind the deportation order in a resolution which had been adopted by 132 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (A/RES/34/29).

63. Israel's aggression and its occupation of the Arab territories would not have been possible without generous economic, political and military assistance from the Western Powers. The problem of the occupied Arab territories could be solved only in the context of a global political solution to the Middle East problem under the auspices of the United Nations, comprising the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories, the participation of all the parties concerned in the negotiations, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, and recognition of the rights of all States in the region to a peaceful and safe existence, including the right of the Arab people of Palestine to the creation of a State of their own.

64. Mr. AL-ZUBI (Jordan) thanked the Special Committee for its report (A/34/631), which exposed Israel's illegal practices in the occupied territories. During the general debate on that item, his delegation had discussed at length the policies and practices used by the Government of Israel to strengthen its occupation of the Arab territories. However, it was also important to stress the impact of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of people in those areas.

65. Security Council resolution 446 (1979) stated that the policy and practices of Israel in establishing settlements in the occupied Arab territories "have no legal validity and constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East" (para. 1). In response, Israel had launched a comprehensive plan to change the demographic and geographical character of the occupied territories. The violation and destruction of the spiritual and educational values of the people, the displacement of inhabitants, the confiscation of land, the demolition of houses, the arrest, interrogation and torture of Arab citizens were all daily events in the occupied territories.

66. Israel's occupation had seriously disrupted the daily life of the inhabitants. As a result of Israel's determination to expel the indigenous

/...

(Mr. Al-Zubi, Jordan)

inhabitants, the Arab population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip had declined by more than 32 per cent since 1967. Only 6 per cent of the indigenous population continued to live in the Golan Heights. He cited several examples of the total or partial destruction of Arab villages in the occupied territories. He added that one form of disruption of the normal life of the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank was the official transfer of part of the inhabitants of the Gaza Strip to the West Bank in late 1967 and early 1968. That had created such pressure on the resources and infrastructure of the West Bank that many inhabitants had ultimately been forced to move to the East Bank. It had also created serious psychological and emotional problems for the displaced inhabitants, who had been forced, with no rational justification, to leave their land and property to the new Jewish settlers. Furthermore, many of the children in that area had been obliged to leave school and to work in Israeli industries, a situation that in turn had had serious consequences on the family unit. Moreover, Israel had not refrained from killing children and teenagers who had expressed resistance to the occupation and to the Israeli settlement policy.

67. Another form of Israeli pressure was the deportation of people for any type of alleged resistance to occupation. Most of the people deported had been professionals. In addition to those deported, there were also many administrative detainees, who had not been brought to trial, but whose release had been made conditional on their agreeing to be expelled.

68. In order further to strengthen its control over the West Bank and other Arab territories, Israel had tried in various ways to bind the economic and social life of the inhabitants to that of Israel. The conditions prevailing under the occupation had forced large numbers of workers from the West Bank to seek jobs in Israel, where they had been drawn by much higher wages, which were, however, low by Israeli standards. That had deprived the West Bank of the bulk of its skilled labour force and of the benefit of their contribution in such fields as agriculture, manufacturing and industry. That had also resulted in a movement of labour from the production sector to the services sector of the West Bank economy.

69. The effect of the Israeli occupation on industry could be seen in a number of different measures. One was the establishment of large industrial complexes in the middle of densely populated Arab areas. The absence of any banking system due to the closure of Arab banks and the Israeli Government's continuous support of its industrial complexes had rendered the Arab industries in the West Bank less competitive. Moreover, the high taxes levied by Israel made savings difficult and that, in turn, had discouraged investment in the productive sectors.

70. In order to implement its settlement policies, Israel had adopted measures to intimidate the Arab population. Although the public schools in the West Bank were still following the Jordanian Government's syllabus, changes had been imposed on the educational policies in order to distort the Arab cultural heritage and to isolate the inhabitants, culturally and emotionally. The Israeli authorities had cancelled all courses dealing with the Palestinian question and, in cases where such courses were permitted, they necessarily reflected the Israeli viewpoint on that question. Teachers had been deported, and students had been interrogated under severe psychological pressure. The closure, expropriation and demolition of schools were other reflections of that tragic situation.

/...

(Mr. Al-Zubi, Jordan)

71. The Israeli authorities had exercised complete control over all means of mass communication in the West Bank since 1967. Printed materials were carefully censored, and nearly 2,000 books, dealing mainly with Arab history, religion, culture, sociology and politics, had been withdrawn from circulation. The occupation authorities had been dividing the Moslem holy places at Al-Haram Al-Ibrahimi and converting part of that area into a synagogue; they had copied Palestinian handicrafts and had presented them internationally as Jewish; and they had changed the historical names of places, towns, and streets.

72. He pointed out that Israel's aggressive policies in those areas were all aimed at a single objective, namely, to obliterate the Palestinian entity. They were all deliberately planned to leave the Palestinian people the option of either abandoning their land and settling permanently in other countries or becoming integrated into Israeli society and living in a ghetto. Moreover, it was misleading to refer to the Israeli "occupation" of the West Bank and the other occupied territories, because Israel's goal was clearly the complete colonization and integration of those areas into Israel. Its policy of establishing settlements, of deporting inhabitants, of demolishing houses and of destroying the economic, educational and cultural values of the people could not be interpreted otherwise.

73. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that when Mr. Shaka, Mayor of Nablus, had been served with a deportation order and had been taken into custody, his delegation had said in the Committee and in the plenary Assembly that that matter had been sub judice and that, therefore, consideration of it by the General Assembly was improper. In fact, before the United Nations had adopted any resolution, the High Court of Israel had temporarily suspended the deportation of the Mayor and had referred his case to the Advisory Committee established under the same regulations as those under which the deportation order had been issued. He had also been given the possibility of applying to the High Court again, after the Advisory Committee had ruled on his case. The Advisory Committee had heard Mr. Shaka's appeal and had informed the Military Governor of its recommendations. The Military Governor had then decided that the deportation order should be set aside and that Mr. Shaka should be released from custody, on the basis, among other things, of declarations he had made expressing his opposition to acts of violence, including the massacre on the Herzliya-Tel Aviv road.

74. He explained that he had described those legal proceedings in detail in order to show once again how wrong the Special Committee, whose report was being discussed, was in asserting dogmatically that no resident of the administered areas had any chance of obtaining justice from the Israeli judiciary, particularly with regard to questions of deportation. Justice was being done in Israel, without favours and without prejudice towards anyone. He wished the same could be said about those who slandered Israel at the United Nations. His delegation also hoped that the decision taken in the case of Mr. Shaka would constitute a further contribution to the peace process and to better understanding between Israel and its neighbours.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.