



UN COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 57: 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 month 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/35/SR.29
19 November 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 57: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)
(A/35/425, 586; A/SPC/35/L.14)

1. Mr. OULD HAYE (Mauritania) said that the Israeli occupation authorities were vainly trying to hide their planned policy of colonization and annexation of the Arab occupied territories under cover of the obstructions put in the way of the Special Committee. That policy was pursued daily through measures based on violence and contempt for mankind which were profoundly changing the historical, religious and democratic character of those territories with the aim of establishing an irreversible fait accompli. The Zionist authorities openly stated their desire to remain in the conquered land for ever. Two convincing examples of that policy were the illegal decision to make the Holy City of Jerusalem the eternal capital of Israel and Israel's declared intention of annexing the Syrian Golan Heights.
2. All those measures were additional evidence of the Israeli's contempt for the relevant international conventions and agreements, in particular the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Charter and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. That contempt had increased over the years despite repeated appeals by the international community, especially the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. It was surely high time that the United Nations reminded Israel that the primary obligation of any Member State was to respect the Charter.
3. Obviously, that open defiance of the wish of the international community could not continue without the support of countries which loudly proclaimed their attachment to justice and human rights. Those who supported Zionist annexation and racial discrimination must realize the extent of their responsibility in the tragedy in which thousands of people in the occupied territories were involved. It was also difficult to believe that they did not realize the permanent threat to international peace and security constituted by such practices, to which the Special Committee had drawn attention in paragraph 304 of its report (A/35/425).
4. The establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East could not be based upon a policy of systematic repression and annexation and the desecration of Islamic and Christian holy places or achieved by vain attempts to uproot, disperse and eliminate a people which had proved by thirty years' struggle its lasting attachment to a land which held the roots of its history, civilization and personality. A just and lasting peace in the Middle East must be based on the conditions constantly reiterated by the international community as a whole, namely the evacuation by Israel of all the Arab occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Palestinian people's fundamental rights of self-determination, independence and national sovereignty as well as the establishment of their own State under its sole authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The course of law and justice could not be for ever obstructed by Zionist obstinancy.

5. Mr. LETYAGO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the report of the Special Committee objectively reflected the real situation in the occupied Arab territories and showed that the Israeli authorities were actively pursuing a policy designed to annex those territories and confiscate or buy up Arab property. Israeli relations with the Arab population were characterized by racism and various forms of political, social and economic discrimination. In carrying out its policy of annexation, Israel violated fundamental human rights, expelled the local Arab population from their lands, systematically demolished Arab towns and villages, and established Jewish settlements in their place. The establishment of such settlements on Arab land occupied in 1967 and the inhuman treatment of the Arab population of Palestine flagrantly violated international law and various resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Israel's policy of annexation directly affected the vital interests and inalienable rights of the Arab countries and peoples which had become the victims of Israeli aggression. After the conclusion of the Camp David accords, Israel had become even more aggressive. The arrogant decision of the Zionist authorities to declare Jerusalem the capital of Israel and the plan to annex the Golan Heights were further proof of that.
6. In spite of the refusal of Israel to co-operate, the Special Committee had been able to carry out its mandate and prepare a comprehensive report giving concrete examples of the inhuman methods employed by Israel in oppressing the local Arab population and proof of systematic violations of fundamental human rights. The report, furthermore, underscored Israel's plans not only to seize the lands of the Arab inhabitants, but also to take control of their minds by inculcating Zionist propaganda.
7. For more than three decades the Middle East had been a hot-bed of military and political tension threatening world peace and security. That problem must be solved on the basis of the collective participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the eastern part of Jerusalem, the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, especially the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State, and the guaranteed independence and development of all States in the region. The strict implementation by Israel of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly would be an important step forward towards the solution of that problem.
8. Mr. KASINA (Kenya) said that every year, the General Assembly was faced by a carefully calculated policy of the Israeli authorities to annex and establish settlements in the occupied territories. The vast sums still being spent by the Israeli Government on planning and establishing those settlements was a clear indication that it did not intend to abandon that policy. His delegation could not accept the excuse of "security" put forward for such practices and did not see how any State could claim that its security could be safeguarded only by occupying the land of another.
9. The Israeli annexation of Palestinian lands was clearly in violation of articles 47 and 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, to which Israel was a signatory.

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

Article 47 prohibited the occupying Power from annexing the whole or part of the occupied territory and article 49 prohibited it from deporting or transferring its own population into the territory it occupied. Yet 127 Jewish settlements had already been established in the occupied territories. The people of Palestine and their leaders were subjected to all sorts of harassment, detention and deportation. All those practices were contrary to the provisions of that Convention. The world community must play its part in protecting the rights of those people who had suffered for so long.

10. The current report of the Special Committee (A/35/425) showed that the events of the past year alone clearly demonstrated Israeli brutality in the occupied areas. The deportation of the mayors of several towns and the attempted assassination of other mayors and civil leaders were a vivid testimony of the harshness of the Israeli authorities. The civilian population of those territories had endured a very long military occupation, which was bound to affect the minds of young people, while the older generation continued to suffer with frustration.

11. His country was strongly opposed to the acquisition of land by force; it deplored Israeli practices in the occupied territories and once more called upon it to heed the opinion of the world community and change its policies in those territories.

12. The United Nations had a historical duty and responsibility to protect the rights of the occupied Palestinians, which were guaranteed in internationally recognized conventions. It was the duty of the international community to see that Member States accepted the obligations contained in those conventions, and Israel must respect its responsibilities as an occupying Power under the Fourth Geneva Convention. The United Nations must again call upon the Government of Israel to abandon its policies of settlement and the annexation of Arab land occupied since 1967, withdraw from all that land, including Jerusalem, and recognize the rights of the Palestinians to exercise the freedom of self-determination and nationhood.

13. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) said that the increasingly aggressive policy of the Israeli authorities had further aggravated the situation in the Middle East. In spite of the refusal of Israel to co-operate with the Special Committee, the report gave a detailed and objective analysis of that situation and demonstrated the Israeli policy designed to change the geographical character, demographic composition and status of the occupied Arab territories. In defiance of repeated appeals from the United Nations, the Zionist authorities had enacted a law declaring Jerusalem the eternal capital of Israel. In spite of Security Council resolution 478 (1980), which strongly condemned that step, the Government of Israel continued to take measures to destroy the Arab character of the city, demolish homes and religious monuments, and expel the Arab population by force. The Knesset, furthermore, was considering a bill calling for the annexation of the Golan Heights. Israel was continuing to establish a network of militarized settlements in the occupied territories as staging grounds for future aggression. The construction of those settlements was accompanied by inhuman treatment of the local Arab population. Acts of racism against the Arab population in violation of the

(Mr. Kalina, Czechoslovakia)

Fourth Geneva Convention were aggravated by illegal imprisonment, torture, collective expulsion, acts of terrorism against officials, and the use of the cruellest means possible in suppressing dissent. Proof of blatant violations of the rights of women and children in the occupied territories had been given at the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women in Copenhagen.

14. The expansionist policy of Israel further underscored the futility of the separate deals between Egypt, Israel and the United States. The Camp David accords, which had been concluded without the participation of the Arab people of Palestine and their legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, completely ignored the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State. The so-called Palestinian autonomy merely served to mask Israel's plan to perpetuate its occupation of Arab lands. Such separate deals not only impeded the settlement of the problem in the Middle East, but also served to increase tension in the region. The United States, whose policy was closely linked to Israeli expansionism, was to a great extent responsible for the aggression and the violations of human rights in the Middle East.

15. His Government firmly condemned the Israeli practice of establishing militarized settlements in the occupied territories and denounced continued Israeli aggression against neighbouring Arab countries. The solution to the problem in the occupied Arab territories must be based on the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State, and the guaranteed independence and security of all States in the region.

16. Mr. PITA ASTUDILLO (Cuba) said that the report of the Special Committee was an anthology of barbarous acts by the occupying Power. The instances of annexation, forced expropriation of land and property, demolition of dwellings, evictions, expulsions, curfews, torture, ill-treatment and inhuman prison conditions all formed part of an Orwellian nightmare in which the Zionist State continued to defy the international community. Between the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly and the current session, much first-hand information had been obtained on conditions in the occupied territories. He recalled the vivid testimony of the Palestinian mayors of Hebron and Halhoul before the Security Council, after they had been forced by the Israeli authorities to abandon their offices and their homeland, and the account of the terrorist attack on the mayor of Nablus.

17. It was clear from the report of the Special Committee that the Israeli policy of annexation was continuing in the occupied territories at the same rate as before. There were even reports that the Zionist authorities intended to annex the Golan Heights. It was obvious from the amounts invested by the Zionist State in planning and establishing its colonialist settlements that the occupants had no intention of ceasing those policies and practices. More than 27 per cent of the occupied territories had been expropriated and taken over by the occupying forces.

(Mr. Pita Astudillo, Cuba)

the only way in which that situation could persist, given the rise of anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist feeling among the population, was through intensified repression and counter-revolutionary terror. The occupied territories were becoming one gigantic gaol.

18. Paragraphs 114 to 222 of the Special Committee's report gave a detailed account of violations of the human rights of the population of the occupied territories by the Israeli Government. In addition, the report described arbitrary and unlawful acts by Israeli soldiers, and the practices of the so-called "settlers" against the inhabitants of the occupied territories, which the Israeli authorities looked upon with indulgence. The basic character of the occupation had not changed, but the level of violence had risen considerably and bloodshed had reached unprecedented proportions. The reaction of the occupying Power to instances of civil resistance was increasingly brutal. The present prison system and conditions and the treatment of detainees was an insult to human dignity and basic human values.

19. He recalled the tragic analogy which the President of Cuba had drawn at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, when he had likened the action of the Nazis in Europe against the Jews to the genocide now being practised by the Israeli authorities against the people of the occupied territories.

20. The verdict of the Special Committee remained the same year after year: despite its earlier recommendations, which the Israeli State had ignored and defied, the situation was unchanged. The only alteration had been a further strengthening of the terrorist policy of the occupying Power. It was possible for that state of affairs to persist and develop, against the will of the people of the occupied territories and at the expense of their human rights, only through the protection and political, economic, military and diplomatic support that Israel received from its Western allies, in particular the United States of America, and also through the appearance of a trend towards capitulation leading to separate arrangements in the region at the expense of the interests of the Arab people of Palestine.

21. The international community had no right to keep silent. It must continue to intensify its efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the area and to prevent the increasing violation of human rights in the occupied territories.

22. Those violated human rights were an integral part of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, now being trampled under foot by the Zionist occupying authority. If the central problem - the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to an independent Palestinian State on their own territory - was resolved, the Committee would no longer have to consider, year after year, the sorry story of violations of human rights in the occupied territories. That time would come, sooner or later. Just as the people of Europe had overthrown fascism, the people of Palestine, with the help of the Arab nation and of peoples throughout the world, would settle accounts with their oppressors. In conclusion, the Cuban delegation wished to reiterate its complete solidarity with the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples in their struggle against imperialism, zionism and capitulation.

23. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) associated himself with the tribute paid by previous speakers to the Chairman and members of the Special Committee and its staff on their success in providing each year, against all odds and difficulties, a report that was at least adequate on the principles and policies of the occupying Power. Their task was doubly unpleasant, both in respect of its subject and in respect of the unpleasant circumstances under which they were obliged to work. He therefore saluted their integrity, forthrightness and perseverance.

24. At the opening of the debate, the representative of Sri Lanka, speaking on behalf of the Special Committee, had drawn attention to the fact that although the report (A/35/425) had been adopted in July, and although many delegations had asked that it should be circulated as early as possible, it had not appeared until the beginning of October. He therefore requested the Chairman to ask the representative of the Secretary-General to explain to the Committee why its wishes had been ignored and why the report had not been made available until a few days before the debate. Some delegations might feel that any resolution adopted on the report should contain language which would ensure that such a situation did not occur again.

25. The first speaker in the current debate had been the representative of Israel, who had offered observations and comments on the report in a manner differing very little from that of his predecessors at previous sessions. One point, however, was somewhat of an innovation. The representative of Israel had argued that the norms of international law in regard to occupied territories should not be severed or detached from the circumstances under which the territory in question had become occupied. The Fourth Geneva Convention, however, contained nothing that would vindicate or exonerate an occupying Power, or allow it to deviate from the established norms, because of the way in which a territory had become occupied. On the contrary, article 1 of the Convention stated that the parties to it undertook to respect its provisions in all circumstances, a concept that was repeated in ensuing articles. The representative of Israel had then proceeded to justify the non-application of the Convention on the basis of a theory of the security of the population or institutions of Israel and the occupied territories. Earlier in the debate (see A/SPC/35/SR.26), the representative of Jordan had recalled a statement by the former Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Sharett, on the security of the region in which Mr. Sharett had pointed out that many of the clashes and incidents that occurred were provoked by Israeli actions. The security crisis invoked by Israel was, in fact, an Israeli invention. Even if the rules of international law could justifiably be violated on such grounds, they would not suffice in the case in point because the insecurity was of Israel's own making.

26. It was possible that Mr. Sharett, a former Prime Minister, was better informed than the representative of Israel regarding the true state of affairs. Mr. Ben Gurion, also the founder of Israel, might well have had a greater vision and a more prophetic outlook than he in regard to Israel and its problems. In an article in the Zionist magazine "Moment", published in the United States in September 1977, the Zionist leader, Nahum Goldman, reminisced about a long interview that he had had with Mr. Ben Gurion shortly before his death. During

(Mr. Sayegh, Kuwait)

that very private meeting, Mr. Ben Gurion had told him that the reason why Israel needed arms and strength was simple, and said that if he had been an Arab, he would never have accepted Israel: the Jews had come and stolen the Palestinians' country and there was no reason why they should make peace. When Mr. Goldman had asked him how he envisaged the future, Mr. Ben Gurion had said that he saw no more than a 50 per cent chance of Israel's surviving for any length of time. When Mr. Goldman asked him how, in the circumstances, he was able to sleep at night, Mr. Ben Gurion asked who had told him that he did sleep. The representative of Israel, who had tried to argue that all the difficulties in the area were the result of the Arab States' refusal to recognize Israel and the fact that there was a state of war, should ponder those words.

27. The representative of Israel had also argued that information on the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories was irrelevant and had nothing to do with human rights. It was clear, however, from the International Covenants on Human Rights and many other United Nations documents and decisions, that one of the chief of such rights was the right of self-determination. Yet the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories altered the demographic composition and institutional structure of the area and indicated a clear determination to deny the population any right to self-determination in the future. The right to property was also a human right, and the Israeli settlements had been built on property stolen from the people of the occupied territories.

28. It was evident from the statements of many Israeli public officials that security was not the only reason for Israel's acts in the occupied territories. Under the doctrine of "Eretz Israel", the West Bank was accounted an integral part of Israel. However, before it had been admitted to the United Nations, Israel had told the Palestine Conciliation Commission that the West Bank belonged to its Palestinian inhabitants and that its future should be determined on the basis of self-determination. According to the report of the Palestine Conciliation Commission of 21 June 1949 (A/927, paras. 28 and 29), the Israeli delegation had claimed to have no ambitions in the central area of Palestine and had said that, pending a final settlement, Israel would continue to recognize Jordan as the de facto occupying Power. After Israel's admission to the United Nations, however, its Foreign Minister had told the General Assembly that the population question, in other words the return or non-return of the Palestinian refugees, was a matter lying within Israel's sovereignty. At that point, Israel had been outside the West Bank, but in 1967 it had occupied that area, and it had worked ever since to make its occupation permanent through practices and policies in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

29. In his glowing account of conditions in the occupied territories, the representative of Israel had claimed that there was freedom of the press and an open society which all could go and investigate for themselves. However, ex-Palestinians were not allowed to go to the occupied territories, nor journalists who did not please the Israeli authorities. Further, many journalists in the occupied territories were not free to practise their trade and were subject to arrest, deportation and detention. The representative of Israel claimed that censorship applied only to security matters and that there was no censorship of political views, but events did not bear him out.

/...

(Mr. Sayegh, Kuwait)

30. It was perhaps significant that the representative of Israel had not, as in earlier years, stressed Israel's guarantees of religious freedom and protection for religious rites and the Holy Places in Jerusalem. For some four or five years, these places had not been immune from the destructive activities of Zionist-Israeli terrorists. When the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Kollek, had reprimanded the current Prime Minister, Mr. Begin, for his silence about attacks on the Christian and Moslem holy places, Mr. Begin had merely said that he did not approve, and harassment and intimidation had continued in the occupied territories. Nevertheless, Mr. Begin saw fit to lecture European countries about promoting anti-semitism by not taking a sufficiently forceful stand against it.

31. Many speakers had dwelt already on the ugliness of the situation portrayed in the report of the Special Committee. He himself had concentrated, therefore, on questioning some of the presuppositions of the Israeli defence of its practices in the occupied territories. It was clear that what was happening in the occupied territories was another indication of Israel's belief that it was above the law. Israel believed that it was entitled to invoke security reasons whenever it wished to suspend the application of international instruments pertaining to occupied territories. That arrogant belief was the reason why Israel had no security, and why Mr. Ben Gurion had been unable to sleep at night, pondering the future of his country.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would provide the information requested on the reasons for the delay in the circulation of the report as soon as possible.

33. Mr. KAZI (Pakistan) proposed that, in view of the importance of the information it contained, the statement of the representative of Kuwait should be reproduced in extenso.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that by decision of the General Assembly the Committee was entitled to the transcription of some parts of its proceedings. He took it that the Committee wished a transcription of the statement to be circulated under that special permission.

35. It was so decided.

36. Mr. DYACHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the report of the Special Committee showed that the situation in the occupied Arab territories had continued to deteriorate as a result of the blatant systematic and massive violations of human rights by the Israeli authorities. Arrogantly ignoring the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Government of Israel pursued a policy of colonization and annexation based on terror and mass repression designed to expel the local Arab population and thus create the necessary lebensraum for future expansionist activities.

37. Israel had intensified its acts of aggression and criminal activities after the signing of the Camp David accords and the conclusion of the separate agreement between Egypt and Israel with the active participation of the United States. Such separate deals, like the current negotiations on so-called Palestinian administrative autonomy, merely served to encourage Israeli aggression, legitimize

(Mr. Dyachenko, Ukrainian SSR)

the presence of the aggressor in the occupied territories and violate the inalienable rights of Palestinian people, especially their right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State. That separate deal further aggravated the situation in the Middle East and created new obstacles to the solution of the Palestinian question, which was the core of the problem in that area. The recent decision of the Knesset declaring Jerusalem the eternal capital of Israel clearly demonstrated the expansionist policy of the Israeli authorities and the true anti-Arab character of the separate Camp David deal.

38. Continued Israeli occupation and aggression was only possible because of support from the United States, which encouraged Zionist expansionism by supplying new armaments and giving comprehensive political, diplomatic, financial and other assistance. On that basis, the Israeli authorities were able to continue their activities designed to drive the Arab population from the occupied territories, thus changing the geographical character and demographic composition of that area. The Israeli Government had already approved plans for the construction of dozens of new settlements and the expansion of already existing ones for the purpose of the total annexation of the occupied Arab territories. It was only natural that that aggressive policy of colonization should meet with increasing resistance on the part of the Palestinian people, led by their sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. In the face of such growing resistance, the Israeli usurpers had sharply increased their campaign of terror and repression, as was well documented in the report of the Special Committee.

39. The only means of stopping repeated Israeli violations of human rights in the occupied territories was to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the problem in the Middle East based on the unconditional and complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish an independent State in Palestine, and the guarantee of the right of all States in the region to live in peace within secure and recognized borders.

40. Mr. RANGA (India) said that his delegation strongly condemned the Israeli authorities' denial of access to the Special Committee to make an on-the-spot investigation. That gave the lie to the assertion that Israel was an open society and that there was no oppression of the Palestinian people in the occupied areas.

41. India's sympathy for the Palestinian people and their cause dated from the years before its independence. Mahatma Gandhi had asserted that Palestine belonged to the Arabs in the same sense that England belonged to the English or France to the French, and that it was wrong and inhuman to impose the Jews on the Arabs. Mr. Nehru had stressed that Palestine was essentially an Arab country, that it must remain so and that the Arabs must not be crushed and suppressed in their own homeland.

42. The views of India on the matter under discussion had been spelt out in the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Rao, in July 1980. He

/...

(Mr. Ranga, India)

had called attention to evidence available at that time of Israeli brutality in the occupied territories and of extreme measures taken to suppress dissent on the part of the Palestinians. He had recalled the deportation of local notables and attempts on their lives, which had elicited no serious attempt on the part of the Israeli authorities to apprehend the criminals or to provide protection to the Arab population. He had criticized the Israeli decision to declare Jerusalem its capital as another attempt to destroy the historic personality of the city and to obliterate its sacred heritage.

43. It was an irony of history that the Jews, themselves persecuted by European Powers, should take such inhuman revenge on the Palestinians. It was folly for Israel to have declared Jerusalem its capital, thereby challenging the world's conscience and its statesmanship to undo the wrong.

44. His delegation hoped that Israel would not choose to follow the example set by South Africa, and that it would not persist in its defiance of the world's demand for the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

45. Israel could not expect the recognition of its neighbours while refusing to recognize the PLO as the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. The United Nations, which had created Israel, in atonement for its failure to implement its earlier decision to create two States within the territory now held by Israel, had recognized the separate existence of Palestine and had granted observer status to the PLO.

46. A comprehensive solution to the problem entailed the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, their right to establish an independent State and the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem. All States in the region, including an Arab Palestine, should guarantee each other's right to live within secure and recognized borders. Until that time, it was the duty of the international community to put a stop to further abuse of the human rights of the Palestinian people.

47. Mr. KRYSOSIK (Poland) said that every year since 1970 the Special Committee had submitted a report containing ample evidence of the troubling practices of the Israeli authorities on occupied Arab lands, and every year the General Assembly had adopted resolutions condemning such practices. Those practices were conducted in persistent violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention; they included the annexation of parts of the occupied territories and the establishment of new Israeli settlements as well as violations of the human rights of the legitimate inhabitants of those territories. The report of the Special Committee contained in document A/35/425 made it absolutely clear that that situation had not changed for the better and that the Government of Israel was continuing to implement its programme of annexation, as a matter of State priority, despite protests from nearly every quarter. By the same token, the current report emphasized the marked increase in the non-observance of certain articles of the Fourth Geneva Convention (A/35/425, para. 10, p. 9) and Israel's continued refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee.

/...

(Mr. Krystosik, Poland)

48. The occupation of Arab land, as well as the general situation in the occupied territories, constituted very serious obstacles to peace in the area. Clearly, the Israeli practices were aimed at changing the status of the occupied territories with a view to perpetuating Israel's domination over them and denying the right to self-determination of the Arab inhabitants.

49. His delegation had long maintained that that intolerable state of affairs had originated from Israel's aggression against the Arab States in June 1967. So long as the effects of such aggression remained, nothing short of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict could bring real, effective solutions to the problems in the occupied territories.

50. In his statement during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs had said, inter alia, that an important component of the struggle to strengthen international security was the reduction and extinguishing of hotbeds of tension and conflict. To the best of its ability, Poland was taking part in efforts in that direction, both within and outside the United Nations. In that connexion, the Foreign Minister had reiterated Poland's position concerning a just and comprehensive settlement, the key issue of which was to ensure independent statehood for the Arab people of Palestine, in accordance with the postulates of the Palestine Liberation Organization, a settlement which would bring lasting security to all the States of the region.

51. In the meantime, his delegation felt that the United Nations should do everything possible to protect the rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories and to lessen their sufferings. Moreover, everything possible should be done to pursue the major goal of ending the Israeli occupation.

52. Mr. LESSIR (Tunisia) said that in spite of the refusal of the Government of Israel to co-operate with the Special Committee, the report provided precise and reliable information, which had not been contradicted by the Government of Israel. He expressed dismay at the brutal and unjust policies and practices carried out by Israel in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. Confronted with resistance from the local Arab population, the Israeli authorities often resorted to the cruellest means possible to drive the Arab inhabitants from their lands. It was particularly regrettable that the Israeli authorities were able to continue to violate accepted norms of international law with impunity. The report furnished ample proof that Israel had no intention of complying with the relevant United Nations resolutions concerning the occupied Arab territories, or the Fourth Geneva Convention, to which it was party. Since its creation, Israel had ignored more than 250 resolutions concerning the Palestinian problem. Security Council resolution 478 (1980) was currently meeting the same fate. His Government expressed its concern at the serious erosion of the authority of the Organization, especially the Security Council, whose resolutions on the problem in the Middle East were constantly violated. It was unthinkable that United Nations recommendations and resolutions should not be implemented and that the State of Israel should continue

(Mr. Lessir, Tunisia)

its policy of annexation, which had been openly encouraged by leading Israeli officials in recent statements. If any State was allowed to remain above the law, the rule of order would give way to the law of the jungle. Israel currently enjoyed a certain immunity which was incompatible with the most fundamental norms of international law and which enabled it openly to defy the will of the international community.

53. His delegation urged the international community to put an end to the blatant injustice suffered by the Arab population in the occupied territories by insisting on the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, and the recognition of the legitimate national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the creation of an independent State within its own national territory.

54. Mr. ADEYAMI (Nigeria) said that for more than a decade, the Israeli presence in the Arab territories seized in the June 1967 war had been institutionalized and transformed into Jewish settlements spreading over the entire area, which constituted a strong element in a conscious and explicit policy of colonization. The settlements themselves were the final outcome of a carefully planned process starting with military or para-military outposts. The entire exercise naturally involved flagrant violations of the basic human rights of the Arab population in the occupied territories and therefore lay at the very roots of the continuing crisis in the Middle East. His delegation believed that any realistic search for peace must take account of happenings in the occupied areas. The process of establishing new settlements must be halted and dozens of other illegal settlements dismantled. All Palestinians, both inside and outside the occupied territories, must be guaranteed freedom to return to their homes and exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence in a politically defined homeland of their own.

55. The policy of establishing Jewish settlements on Arab lands, which had been initiated in 1967, had been brought momentarily to a halt when, during the October war of 1973, the devastating effects of Arab armour had exposed the false assumptions on which the settlement policy had originally been based. The Israeli Labour Government had then embarked on a Twenty Year Plan in 1975 with the main objective of establishing the Israeli presence in strategic areas of the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem. The Israelis were already in control of 70 to 80 per cent of the cultivable land in the Jordan valley and had developed an extensive infrastructure, involving the creation of a wide network of irrigation water pipelines, electric lines and underground telephone cables to serve and connect the illegal colonies in the whole area. The Israeli objectives in the pattern and location of those settlements were two-fold: to cut off the West Bank's populated areas from any physical contact with east Jordan and to contain the Palestinian population by surrounding it on all sides by two creeping belts of Jewish colonies. The policies of the Israeli military administration in the occupied territories were both callous and indefensible, callous because the settlements automatically involved a systematic eviction of Arab families from their lands, which were their only source of livelihood, and morally indefensible

(Mr. Adeyami, Nigeria)

because Israel had always justified eviction on the pretext of shoring up its so-called security, only to turn over the sequestered property to new Jewish immigrants. In order to survive, Palestinian workers had had to build houses for Israeli immigrants and work for Israeli owners on the farms they had once owned.

56. The cultural aspects of the Israeli occupation were equally disturbing. Dramatic scripts had to be submitted to Israeli military censors for advance approval, all references to the Palestinian entity were strictly forbidden and repressive measures were increasingly directed against intellectuals, students and potential political leaders. Even muted outward expressions of Palestinian nationalism had provoked reprisals completely out of proportion to the acts themselves. The military administration had resorted more and more to unwarranted deportation of Palestinian leaders, invariably carried out under a law of administrative detention, a heritage from the days of the United Kingdom Mandate, when they had been used against Jewish partisans.

57. Under international law, the Israeli settlements were obviously illegal and in continuing to establish them, the Israeli Government was in breach of specific international agreements. Apart from the fact that the policy of colonization constituted a defiance of United Nations resolutions and of the spirit of the Charter, there were also the particular obligations imposed on any occupying Power by section III of the Fourth Geneva Convention, of which Israel was a signatory.

58. At the Committee's twenty-fifth session, the Israeli representative had tried to prove that the people living under Israel's military rule were happy and even free by citing certain social services which he claimed that Israel was providing. Even if those claims were true, they would not alter the fact that a colonial régime existed in the occupied territories. The Committee had been told of a "coexistence" that was mutually beneficial to the two communities. That coexistence was of a special nature, since the settlements were exclusively for Jews. The Israeli concept of coexistence was therefore not one of equals but one between a dominant invader and the subordinate indigenous population, kept docile by a combination of military force and political and economic inducements. Those were the classic devices employed by the United Kingdom and many other colonial empires. The régime was certainly more enlightened, humane and efficient than the brutal subjugation of populations practised by the Germans in Europe during the Second World War, but it was still colonialism, and anachronistic in the twentieth century.

59. Except for Israel itself, world opinion was unanimous that the on-going Israeli colonization of the West Bank was both illegal and an obstacle to peace. However, the motivating instinct behind Israeli expansionism in the occupied territories undoubtedly lay in the deep conviction of Israel's current leaders that the so-called "Judaea and Samaria" was the patrimony of the Jewish people, a gift from the Supreme Being which could not be revoked even by Arab "squatters" who had lived on the land for 2,000 years. It was odd in the modern world to make territorial claims on purely religious grounds. For example, when the Israeli

(Mr. Adevami, Nigeria)

Prime Minister had been told that the Knesset's decision to make Jerusalem Israel's so-called eternal capital was inconsistent with international law, he had replied that Jerusalem had been the Jewish capital for 3,000 years. If that dangerous thesis went unopposed, it would set an ominous precedent which could lead only to international anarchy.

60. No one really questioned Israel's sincere apprehension for its security. However, since the Begin Government had come to power, the emphasis had shifted to religious, biblical grounds. That seemed to be where the conviction lay. It placed Israel in direct defiance of the modern world's primary standards of equity for the drawing of international frontiers, the principle of self-determination and the rights of peoples, as far as possible, to live within a political jurisdiction of their own choice. There being no practical way to reconcile the two standards, the Israelis had found themselves in a painful moral dilemma with respect to the Palestinian people. The Nazi pogroms remained one of the greatest horrors of the modern world. It was not uncommon for victims and oppressors to become brutalized through the experience of oppression. However, the Israeli nation was made up of people, many of whom had suffered; and because of that suffering they should be more sensitive to the effects of oppression, discrimination and deprivation. Unfortunately, they seemed to be using that experience as the rationale for victimizing others and to be transferring their pain to defenceless Palestinians. A few mavericks had faced the dilemma squarely, acknowledging the rights of the Palestinians and the wrongs done them by successive expulsions following the occupation of their land.

61. Morally speaking, the colonization of Arab territories occupied since 1967 following hostilities was wrong and indefensible. It was doing as much violence to the fabric of Israeli society as to the legitimate rights and aspirations of the people on whom Israel sought to impose its authority. Politically, the annexation of East Jerusalem, the establishment of new settlements or the expansion of existing settlements in territories from which the world had long decided that Israel would have to withdraw, was futile and self-defeating and perpetuated the very hostility which it should be Israel's first objective to disarm.

62. It was high time the United Nations squarely faced the challenge posed by Israel's continuing brazen defiance of the collective will of the international community. That community must demand immediate compliance by Israel with all pertinent resolutions adopted on that issue. Should Israel persist in its settlement policy, the appropriate provisions of the Charter for dealing with recalcitrant States must be applied. To avoid the full impact of such provisions, Israel must revise its policies and desist from its condemnable measures which violated the principles of natural justice and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Above all, it must withdraw totally and unconditionally from the occupied territories to facilitate the return home of dispossessed Palestinians in safety and dignity. The Nigerian Government, consistent in its support for all peoples struggling for their legitimate rights of self-determination and independence, would continue to extend diplomatic and political support to all dispossessed Palestinians until their natural rights were conceded and their God-given land was liberated from the foreign stranglehold.

63. Mr. AVN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the refusal of the Zionist entity to allow the Special Committee to enter the occupied territories was part of its scheme to distort the facts and conceal its crimes. Its refusal had been based upon arguments incompatible with the most elementary norms of law or logic. The facts presented in the report of the Special Committee clearly proved that the policies and practices of the Zionist entity were in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of its resolutions and were contrary to the principles of international law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The forcible appropriation of Arab lands by the Zionist entity was continuing. Its plans for annexation and expansion for the establishment of settlements and for the alteration of the physical characteristics and demographic composition of the territories were multiplying. The demolition of houses, the expulsion of Arab inhabitants from their homes and the prevention of their return were frequent events. Mass arrests, the imposition of curfews and the torturing of thousands of Arab prisoners under interrogation were continuing from day to day.

64. The report proved that the Zionist entity had expanded its settlement plan and was establishing settlements in all parts of the occupied territories, thereby violating the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the resolutions of the United Nations on the matter. The decision of the Zionist entity to proclaim Jerusalem as its eternal capital was an indication of the profound changes contemplated by the occupation authorities in implementation of their expansionist and colonialist plans. The expropriation measures mentioned in paragraphs 55 to 77 of the report were examples of a racist practice aimed at establishing an exclusive homeland for the Zionists in Palestine.

65. Legal measures enacted since 1948 demonstrated the full extent of racial discrimination as a prominent characteristic of Zionist legislation, which permitted the seizure of Arab land, stipulated that it could be transferred to Zionist ownership only and prevented Arabs even from working on it. The Settlement Act, which prevented and punished the leasing of land to Arabs, merely re-echoed the early Zionist slogan of "Hebrew labour" in a new guise. That slogan had called for the expulsion of Arab workers and peasants and for the reservation of agricultural work for Zionists only.

66. The various forms of oppression and torture daily practised by the Zionists against the civilian inhabitants were instrumental in bringing about the displacement of persons, a step which the Zionists regarded as necessary to make way for the introduction of new immigrants to provide the manpower needed to realize the Zionist plan in Palestine and the occupied territories.

67. That plan had been clearly defined by Chaim Weizmann when he had said that Palestine would, as a result of immigration, ultimately be for the Jews alone. It was the plan envisaged by Zionist legislation which accorded the right of citizenship to any Zionist immigrant but denied that right to the Palestinians, who were the true owners of the land. Zionism, in alliance with the imperialist Powers, had conspired against the Palestinian people, had denied them the right to return to their homeland and had characterized their legitimate struggle as terrorism, inverting the true facts and spreading deception. The General Assembly

(Mr. Awn, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

had adopted numerous resolutions reaffirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and their right to exercise those rights in Palestine, and had recognized the PLO as their legitimate representative. The Zionist entity had paid no heed to those resolutions but had persisted in implementing its colonialist programme.

68. The international community must put an end to the Israeli occupation and take all necessary steps to safeguard human rights in the occupied Arab territories.

69. Mr. MAKSOUD (Observer, League of Arab States) said that the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (A/35/425) illustrated in an organized, thorough and documented manner the ever-increasing violations by the Israeli occupation authorities of all legal, human, national and territorial rights of the population of the occupied territories.

70. The report sought to be comprehensive and to meet fully the tests and standards of verifiability. It was a complete tabulation of violations, arrests, trials, reprisals, demolition of houses and structures, the sealing off of houses and shops, evictions, curfews, measures affecting educational institutions, the establishment of new colonial settlements and the strengthening of existing ones. It described Israeli plans to pursue annexation policies further and revealed the "legalisms" which the Israeli authorities sought to introduce in order to mutilate the national, cultural and demographic character of the occupied territories, as a prelude to the final blow that would destroy the territorial base upon which a Palestine national identity and State could be built.

71. The report showed beyond any doubt that the pattern of conquests and annexation was, in Israel's view, irreversible. It confirmed again that the occupation authorities would continue to pursue Israel's declared objectives unimpressed and unaffected by the views and decisions of the international community. Israel's actions betrayed a studied indifference to - or rather a studied contempt of - the world's convictions. The report put the whole question of Israel's behaviour in the occupied territories in a different context. The pattern of that behaviour and of Israel's practices affecting the human rights of the population could no longer be treated in isolation from the over-all philosophical and ideological premises upon which the Israeli State was predicated. Israel's plan to deflect the world community - and especially the United Nations - from linking a perception of its ideology to the over-all thrust of its actual practices was a deliberate effort to weaken world leverage by causing attention to be focused on detailed aspects of its violations.

72. The Special Committee's report and the results of its investigations would be censured by Israel, not because it thought itself right or wrong but because it considered that it was immune from any investigation and that its behaviour was unaffected by universal standards, laws or criteria. Israel had been able to get away with such defiance because the world community was more readily disposed to

(Mr. Maksoud, Observer, League of Arab States)

censor and condemn than to penalize and sanction. That discrepancy between word and deed enabled Israel to buy more time, and to manipulate its special relationship with the United States and use it for paralysing United Nations mechanisms.

73. For the last 12 years, the Special Committee had submitted reports that had constituted a welcome contribution to the general awareness not only of the Palestinian question but also of the danger of the Zionist State. Although awareness and the availability of credible and objective information would ultimately force Israel into some measure of accountability, a far more important question was: how was it that Israel could proceed with its violations and practices unimpeded? An answer to that central question required an analysis of Israel's behaviour pattern and of the way in which it was related to the ideological base upon which Israel was built. Without such analysis, issues emerging from Israel's violations and aggression would be disjointed, and the thrust of the international community's censure and condemnation would be defused and dissipated. A fuller comprehension of the substance and meaning of the report of the Special Committee and the significance of its conclusions would help to ensure that United Nations involvement in the question, and its recommendations on ways of dealing with Israeli practices in the occupied territories, were not always met with the frustrations which the Special Committee had encountered and that moral indignation was not always associated with practical helplessness.

74. Even as the Committee was dealing with the report, Israel had already undertaken to establish new settlements and to finalize its annexation of Jerusalem; and it was planning to introduce a "law" in the Knesset for the annexation of the Golan Heights. Although Israel debated whether its settlements were for the purpose of security or of "biblical fulfilment", the essential point for Israel was that the Knesset's decisions must not only be carried out but acquiesced in. That was why Israel kept leap-frogging from one issue to another. A furore about Jerusalem would subside if another furore emerged concerning the Golan Heights, and, if Israeli settlements on the West Bank were denounced as illegal, then Israel would strike at towns, villages, cities and refugee camps in southern Lebanon.

75. Israel's aim was that the world should not perceive the oneness of its conquering and colonizing objective but should look at Israel's violations and transgressions as isolated issues in separate categories and should not therefore deal coherently, consistently, effectively and decisively with the thrust of its strategic objective in and outside the occupied territories. In other words, Israel planned to swallow up Arab territories piecemeal, to make its conquests final and to prevent the world community from imposing its will and applying its laws. Israel hoped that, with the passage of time, repetition of complaints would bore the world into acquiescing in its conquests, annexation and racist structures.

76. That Israeli technique of preventing the world from focusing on Zionism's central strategy in the region should be faced without complacency or equivocation.

(Mr. Maksoud, Observer, League of Arab States)

In order to meet that unique challenge, it was essential to understand the ideology of Israel for what it was, and to avoid the trap of believing that Israel was a normal State. Israel saw itself not as a State but as the nucleus of an empire. That was why it was the only Member State of the United Nations which had no defined or declared borders, and had not in any document undertaken to define them. Hence, Israel was not only a State that was, but a State that by its own definition was becoming. That was why Israel could say that an act that the international community unanimously declared to be a violation was simply the application of Israeli law in occupied territories. The term "occupied territories" was never mentioned in the lexicon of Israeli diplomacy and legalism. The territories concerned were called "Judea" and "Samaria" - thus signalling a theocratic justification for annexing the West Bank - or were described as "administered territories", the word "administered" being used in a sense that was qualitatively distinct from the function of administering occupied territories in accordance with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

77. Israel was based on the philosophy that there was a permanent polarization between the Jew and the "other". In accordance with such rationalization, Israel was entitled to do whatever it wanted for the Jew because, according to its Zionist ideology, no other persons had the right to interrupt, intervene or interfere. That was, in essence, the crux of the Zionist ideology, which ran counter to all humanist, rational and integrationist policies. That ideology was, in fact, the other side of the anti-Semitic coin. Both were racist ideologies predicated on the alienation of the Jew; and, therefore, the struggle against anti-Semitism was by definition a struggle against zionism.

78. The Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories were to Israel "other" persons. They were human obstacles to the unfolding of zionism and Israeli design. Their presence might be tolerated but their rights, whether human or national, did not come within the scope of tolerance. If the inhabitants must remain, they had to be cut off from all forms of self-expression, not to mention self-determination. Jewish settlers in the occupied territories were seen by Israel as the fulfilment of a design and the realization of a plan, while the presence of the inhabitants of the occupied territories was viewed as a "historical accident" that should not obstruct Israel's designs and plans. Israel's strategic threat to the region constituted a danger not only to the "other" persons in the occupied territories, but ultimately also to those in whose name Israel claimed to speak - namely, the constituency of Jews everywhere.

79. The international community must face that challenge in its entirety. That was not an easy task, in view of the limited mandate given to the Special Committee and the modalities by which crises were usually handled. However, if the United Nations wished to ensure that the investigation of that particular issue would not lead to the futile situation which Israel's stone-walling was intent on perpetuating, it must see Israeli objectives in their totality.

(Mr. Maksoud, Observer, League of Arab States)

60. Year after year, the international community had watched Israel's violations of human rights becoming more and more systematic, its annexation policies more emboldened, its tactics more shrill and vindictive, its vengeance more bloody and its measures more deeply imbued with an aura of finality. Israeli tactics, such as the pre-emptive strikes against Lebanon and the Palestinian refugee camps, were a clear indication that Israel sought not only to sow confusion and not only to consolidate its occupation of territories but also to establish a record of unilateral striking capability that would enhance its strategic hegemony and its capability for destabilization in the region.

61. Through its unilateral decision to attempt to annex Jerusalem, and through its obstinate quest to disfigure the religious, civilizational and cultural heritage of that sacred city, Israel might be seeking to illustrate its intentions towards every piece of land it touched and every place where its dominating role could be expanded. It was a racist and Fascist entity, unchecked by any restraints and not tied by any of the bonds that nations had accepted as a precondition for meaningful intercourse. If the United Nations failed to take immediately all measures necessary to contain that over-indulgence, and to ensure that Israel submitted to the international will as embodied in United Nations resolutions, it would be contributing to graver tension and instability and endangering the future of peace and security in the region.

62. In conclusion, he emphasized that the apparent diversity of problems and issues emerging from Israeli aggression and expansion in all directions should not prevent the international community from focusing on the Israeli-Zionist challenge as an integral whole. Awareness of the interrelationship between Israel's ideology, its behaviour pattern, its policies and its attitude of systematic and studied contempt towards the United Nations and its Charter and resolutions would undoubtedly lead the Committee to adopt resolutions that were implementable and would become the corner-stone of a just and comprehensive peace. An integral view and analysis of the Israeli-Zionist challenge to the region would make it easier to understand what the Special Committee's report implied not only for the human rights of the population in the occupied territories but for the credibility of the United Nations, the future effectiveness of its machinery and resolutions, and the destiny of the peoples of the Middle East.

63. Mr. NA (Senegal) said that during the past 12 years the Special Committee had been submitting increasingly overwhelming evidence of growing violations of human rights in the occupied territories. He expressed appreciation to the members of the Special Committee for the very useful information contained in the current report, which had been prepared despite Israel's persistent refusal to co-operate. While condemning the Israeli reprisals against the Arab population of the occupied territories, the international community must also denounce Israel's attempts to Zionize thousands of people through the establishment of settlements, since such action was particularly reprehensible in the context of the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the Charter of the United Nations. It was essential to end Israel's illegal practices, which would not have occurred without its uninterrupted occupation of those territories since 1967.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

84. All the information provided by the Special Committee confirmed that Israel was still determined to perpetuate the precarious situation of the population of the occupied territories. Accordingly, the Committee should denounce such practices and should demand Israel's withdrawal from all those territories, including Jerusalem. Only a just and lasting settlement, which guaranteed respect for the rights of all parties in the region, could help to establish peace in the Middle East and enable the Semitic people to bring to the world their very special message of humanism.

85. Mr. RAININ (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he felt the statement made by the representative of Morocco had had a basic humanitarian message and had contained avenues of hope for the future. However, he regretted the bitter, extremist language which that representative had used. The representative of Morocco had drawn attention to the different opinions, some even critical of the Israeli Government's policies, that existed in Israel and within the Zionist movement. Such differences of opinion were a cause for pride and a credit to Israel, because they showed that Israel had a free and democratic society.

86. With regard to the comments made by the representative of Kuwait concerning Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Sharett, he observed that Mr. Sharett had stretched out his hands in peace to Israel's Arab neighbours and to the Palestinian Arabs on countless occasions at the United Nations. Mr. Ben Gurion had also sought peace on numerous occasions, but his efforts had not been reciprocated. It had been asserted during the current meeting that the main obstacle to peace was Israel's presence in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In that connexion, he pointed out that for 19 years, from 1948 to 1967, there had been no Israeli presence in either the West Bank or the Gaza Strip, but the Arabs had not sought peace with Israel during those years. The Arab States had not accepted the Partition Plan but had made war, and in 1946 had refused to accept a mere 100,000 refugees from the holocaust in Europe. Israel had consistently been rejected by the Arabs, long before there had been an Israeli presence in the West Bank or the Gaza Strip. Accordingly, it was important to see the sequence of events in the proper context. The fundamental problem had always been the Arabs' psychological barrier, which prevented them from accepting the existence of Israel.

87. Several speakers had referred to the suffering of the Palestinian Arabs and, in that connexion, he assured them that Israel was aware of the suffering both of the Palestinian Arabs and of the Palestinian Jews, because in any conflict both sides suffered. For that very reason, Israel had been seeking peace and harmony for 30 years; but, in so doing, it could not tolerate acts of violence by terrorist organizations which sought to liquidate Israel.

88. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of Israel had said that freedom of expression was a credit to any democratic society. However, he drew attention to the selectivity with which Israel enabled people to exercise that freedom. For example, a Jewish Israeli citizen in Israel could disagree with the Government but, under a law passed

(Mr. Sayegh, Kuwait)

recently, if an Arab did so, he would be subject to exile. By the same token, the population of the occupied territories could not express any dissent. Schools and universities were all regulated, and the mayors of towns in the occupied territories were not even allowed to assemble. In his opinion, the representative of Israel could not take credit for the differences of views allowed in Israel unless such privileges were extended to everyone. Otherwise, the situation in Israel was no better than the situation in South Africa, where only whites enjoyed such freedom.

89. The representative of Israel had also referred to the many times Moshe Sharett had sought peace at the United Nations. However, the "fine print" underlying all such efforts had been that Israel had no intention of permitting people to return to the land it had taken. In other words, Israel had invited the Arabs to make peace, provided that they acquiesced in Israeli usurpation of Arab lands and Israeli denial of the rights of the indigenous population, including its right to self-determination.

90. The representative of Israel had also said that, even before Israel's occupation of the West Bank, the Arab States had refused to accept the existence of Israel. That had been due to the fact that Israel had already become established on the land of some 1 million Palestinians; that fact was just as important as the occupation of the West Bank and subsequent developments.

91. With regard to the Israeli representative's reference to terrorist organizations, he pointed out that the Arab States were dealing with a terrorist State which had already denied the Palestinian people its right to exist.

92. Mr. MAKSOU (Observer, League of Arab States), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative's reference to a psychological barrier was a strategem frequently used to undermine the credibility of a critic when no answer could be found to his criticism. Moreover, the nebulous words "psychological barrier" had racist overtones. The Arab attitude towards Israel was determined not by a propensity for rejection, but by the fact that Arab people had been forcibly expelled from their homeland.

93. In connexion with the Israeli representative's reference to terrorist organizations, he stressed that the Palestine Liberation Organization was not only the sole representative of the Palestinian people, it was also the framework for Palestinian "peoplehood" and a state of mind for the Palestinians. Throughout history, liberation movements had habitually been described as terrorist organizations by colonial and racist entities and States that were now in oblivion; thus, the Palestine Liberation Organization was in good company.

94. Mr. RAMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, and referring to the representative of Kuwait's comments concerning Israel's selectivity in allowing freedom of expression, stressed that Israel was not opposed to the exercise of such freedom, but was definitely opposed to any activities aimed at liquidating the State of Israel or supporting the advancement of the goals of the

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

Palestine Liberation Organization. A detailed statement concerning his Government's position in that connexion had been made earlier. However, he drew the representative of Kuwait's attention to the Covenant of the Palestine Liberation Organization, at least 12 articles of which were devoted to the liquidation and destruction of Israel. In that connexion, he read out article 19 which stated that the partitioning of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of Israel had been fundamentally null and void from the outset.

95. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the people in the occupied territories knew whether or not they enjoyed freedom of expression, regardless of what might be said at the United Nations. For example, earlier during the current meeting he had drawn attention to five editorials that had been censored. Those editorials had been expressions of opinion concerning President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem. That kind of practice was precisely what he had been referring to when he had said that the inhabitants of the occupied territories did not enjoy freedom of expression.

96. With regard to article 19 of the Covenant of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in his opinion, jurists could still debate the question whether the General Assembly had the legal mandate to partition any country. The International Court of Justice had been asked for its opinion in that connexion, but the Arab countries had been defeated by the automatic majority of that time. Moreover, while the Partition Plan had provided for the Arab population to remain under the protection of the General Assembly, Israel had expelled the Arabs, making them refugees, and had denied their right to return. The jurists of the Palestine Liberation Organization had considered that situation to be illegal, and he agreed.

97. Mr. RAHMANI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, agreed with the representative of Kuwait that Israel was a democratic society only for the Jews. On the previous day, the Foreign Minister of the Government of Menachem Begin, when inaugurating a new settlement in northern Palestine, had declared that the founding of a new settlement constituted a step towards the Judaization of Galilee and the expulsion of aliens therefrom; in fact, he had meant the expulsion of the indigenous inhabitants. By the same token, the Israeli Parliament had recently enacted a law whereby any citizen - in other words, any Palestinian Arab citizen - could be stripped of his citizenship, and another law prescribing a penalty of three years' imprisonment and a fine of \$5,000 for singing a Palestinian song or raising a Palestinian flag. Such examples showed just how democratic Israeli society was.

98. When the Israeli representative had referred to dialogue with the Arabs, he had put the cart before the horse, because he had not been referring to dialogue with the Palestinian people; that would be inconsistent with the Israeli perception of the Palestinians. Moreover, a call for dialogue was often used as a screen to cover up a variety of crimes.

(Mr. Rahman, Observer, PLO)

99. With regard to the Covenant of the Palestine Liberation Organization, he drew attention to the fact that Palestine was occupied and must be liberated; that situation had given rise to the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The Palestinian people were neither Jordanian nor Syrian nor Lebanese, and they would continue to defend their identity as Palestinians. The PLO Covenant contained their ideology and their political response to the programme of the Zionist movement, which denied the existence of the Palestinian people. That Covenant would remain in effect so long as the Zionist position remained unchanged. However, if any change occurred in the Zionist denial of the Palestinian people's existence, a corresponding change would be effected in the Covenant.

100. Mr. ADIAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the representative of Israel's comments concerning Israel's offers of peace, even before its invasion of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and the Arab's refusal of that offer. In that connexion, he drew attention to the fact that the peace advocated by Israel and proposed to the Arab countries had been accompanied by a wave of military assaults against all the Arab countries. The joint Syrian-Israeli armistice commission had condemned Israel for its aggression on more than 26,000 occasions. Israel had occupied Palestinian Arab land since 1967; it had recently declared the Golan Heights to be part of Israeli territory and had stated that it would never return that area to Syria, even if a peace agreement were signed by both States. In 1974, when Israel had been obliged under the disengagement agreement to return the town of Quneitra to Syria, the town -- according to reports by an impartial committee -- had been left in ruins. When the Syrians had returned, they had found inscriptions on the walls to the effect that if Syria ever recovered Quneitra, it would find it in ruins. That incident illustrated the type of peace proposed by Israel.

101. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone its consideration of draft resolutions A/SPC/35/L.14, L.15, L.16 and L.17 and the vote thereon until 18 November, but that the debate on agenda item 57 should be closed.

102. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.