

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



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
39th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 23 November 1981  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 64: 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/36/SR.39  
7 December 1981  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 64: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/36/579, A/36/85, A/36/588; A/SPC/36/L.18-L.24)

1. Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen) said that ever since it had been established the Special Committee had had difficulty carrying out its mission owing to Israel's refusal to co-operate.
2. Referring to Israel's practices in the occupied territories, he said that Israel had refused to supply water to the population of certain parts of those territories, had established new settlements, had expropriated houses and destroyed the homes of the Palestinian population and had built new houses to be offered to foreign Jews. Moreover, it had closed Bir Zeit University and had expelled the mayors of two towns, in addition to shamelessly annexing the City of Jerusalem.
3. The Palestinian people could not accept such a regime and would continue fighting for the establishment of a Palestinian State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization.
4. Referring to the Camp David Accords, he said that they had not brought about peace because they ignored the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people. The Government of the United States, for its part, was supporting Israel through the provision of military and political assistance, which encouraged Israel to continue its policy of aggression against the Palestinian people.
5. If peace in the Middle East was to be achieved, Israel must withdraw from the occupied territories, the Palestinian people's right to establish their own independent State must be recognized, the Palestine Liberation Organization must be recognized and the Security Council must impose economic and military sanctions on Israel.
6. In his view, the idea that the United States was playing a positive role was unacceptable as long as that country was participating in Israel's activities and providing it with the means of applying its policy of aggression. Israel and the United States constituted a single enemy which would go on perpetrating acts of barbarism in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention.
7. Mr. TADLAOUI (Algeria) observed that the Special Committee's report was being examined at a time when the situation in the occupied territories was particularly serious, owing primarily to the "institutionalized terror" directed against the Arab population. What was happening at the present time in the occupied territories was the result of a vast undertaking aimed at systematically making aggression and spoliation profitable. The aim was to uproot the Arabs once and for all from their homes and use their property for the establishment of new settlements.

/...

(Mr. Tadlaoui, Algeria)

8. Currently there were more than 122 Zionist settlements in the territories occupied since 1967. Moreover, the Director of the Jewish Agency, Matitiahou Drobles, had drawn up a plan providing for the establishment of a further 75 settlements. Those figures sufficed to reveal the magnitude of the process of expropriation, the pretext for which was usually absence of title to ownership of land or the vagueness of title where it existed. The Zionist authorities simply declared the properties to be "State land" before seizing them definitively.

9. The Zionist army of occupation used a variety of methods to expel the Arabs from their territory: intimidation, expropriations, punitive operations, the application of repressive laws and so forth. Measures had also been taken to divert water in the West Bank for the benefit of Zionist settlements, leaving Arab lands waterless so that they were now rapidly turning into desert. Special meters had been installed to control and ration water consumption by the Palestinians. In addition, wells had been expropriated.

10. The reduction in the extent of cultivated Arab land owing to confiscation had resulted in a decrease in the number of Palestinians engaging in agriculture. Crops which could have supplied the West Bank with food had been abandoned in favour of crops to be sold on the Zionist market. Moreover, the reduction in water resources hampered the industrial development of the West Bank in many ways, and was thus essential to the process of uprooting the population and taking over the Arab electricity company of El Qods.

11. The exploitation of Arab labour, which, depending on the season, affected between 50,000 and 200,000 workers a year, had prompted a resolution adopted recently by the Second Committee of the General Assembly which condemned Israel for the deterioration of the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and, in addition to denouncing its refusal to permit a group of experts to enter these territories, reaffirmed that the termination of Israeli occupation was a precondition for the economic and social development of the Palestinian people.

12. Several months earlier the Zionist leaders had promulgated a new ordinance enabling them to limit the validity of the identity cards of Arab inhabitants. In future the Zionist militarists would not have to issue expulsion decrees: all they would have to do would be to refuse to renew the identity cards of such persons.

13. Thus the Palestinian Arabs were suffering oppression, torture, the spoliation of their property and expulsion from their homeland in the name of a Nazi-inspired Zionist ideology condemned by history. Palestinian cultural expression was being hampered by measures such as the "education act" through which the Zionists controlled educational establishments, determined curricula and limited and disrupted the functioning of Arab higher education, as attested by the closing of the Universities of Bir Zeit and Beit Lahm Bethlehem. It should be noted that only 3.5 per cent of the 60,000 students in occupied Palestine were Arabs.

/...

(Mr. Tadlaoui, Algeria)

14. There could be no doubt that those practices constituted a link in a chain of measures dating back to 1948 whose consequences were the establishment of Jewish settlements and the eviction of the Palestinians from their lands. In that connexion he recalled a statement cited by Mr. Ilan Halevi to the effect that the Jews would settle not only on Mount Ararat but also in Yemen. Those measures and others like them contradicted the spirit and letter of articles 49 and 53 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

15. More and more frequently reprisals were being taken against individuals and groups for the slightest manifestation of resistance, as exemplified by the brutal treatment inflicted during the current year on the towns which had participated in the sixty-fourth anniversary of the disastrous Balfour Declaration.

16. Conditions in the Zionist prisons were disgraceful; over-crowding and malnutrition encouraged the propagation of various diseases. The treatment received and the lack of medical attention sometimes caused the death of many prisoners. In other cases, detainees were subjected to torture of various kinds. The Palestinian population was still enduring the sufferings of occupation but they were more determined than ever to resist.

17. The Zionists refused to recognize the fact of an Arab people determined to live in freedom and were trying to find the unattainable "third force." They planned to invest heavily in the establishment of what they euphemistically termed "village associations," groups of sinister memory, which, with the help of traitors to the Palestinian cause, were designed to hasten the achievement of a spurious autonomy.

18. To the Zionists and their supporters, the Palestinian people of the occupied Territories once again proclaimed its total opposition to a fictitious civil administration in the West Bank and in Gaza, as a harbinger of the annexation of those Territories by the Zionist entity. Similarly, all attempts to deny it the right to self-determination and the restoration of its legitimate rights had been rejected, as its hostility to the Camp David and Washington agreements showed. The fundamental problem of the Palestinian people was more than a humanitarian one; it also had clearly-defined political aspects.

19. His delegation was convinced that the question of Palestine was at the very heart of the Middle East crisis and that no solution to the problem was possible until the Palestinian people was permitted to exercise all its national rights. Those rights meant, as the relevant United Nations resolutions indicated, realization of the right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty and to return to its homeland and to create its own sovereign State, as well as the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in all discussions and conferences on the Middle East held under the auspices of the United Nations.

20. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America) said that his country's dedication to the success of the Camp David process and to guaranteeing that the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel would be the first step in that process made it fully aware of the importance of safeguarding human rights in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and

/...

(Mr. Lichenstein, United States of America)

other places in the Middle East. Hence reports on human rights in the entire region must be scrupulously accurate, complete and impartial and must place the problems within a broader perspective.

21. In 1968 the Government of the United States had voted against General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) which decided to establish a Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. It had done so because that Committee had been requested to limit its humanitarian concern to the inhabitants of the occupied Territories without regard for the situation of the Jewish minorities in certain States of the disputed area. Moreover, his delegation had repeatedly stated its view that the continuation of the investigations conducted by groups such as the Special Committee was unnecessary and would probably result only in sterile recrimination. In reports dealing with human rights violations, the application of simplistic criteria must be avoided. Nevertheless, the Special Committee's reports continued to be based on incomplete accounts of the conditions in the occupied Territories and relied heavily on dubious sources of information.

22. He restated the position that, until a negotiated solution pursuant to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) was reached, his Government would continue to regard Israel as the military occupier of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, with all the international law obligations of a State in that situation. The only real way to guarantee human rights was through peace, not war, which meant recognition of the territorial integrity of all the States of the region. The military occupation had lasted 14 years largely because of the refusal of certain interested parties to negotiate.

23. Despite the new hope which the peace treaty between the old enemies, Egypt and Israel, had inspired, criticisms were constantly being levelled in the Special Political Committee. At the current session, the term nazism was intolerably and obscenely linked to the practices of the Israeli Government. Several days previously, the representative of Jordan had labelled as treacherous the Camp David agreements, which he viewed as a means for the total removal of the Palestinians from their national territory. On the contrary, a procedure conducive to general peace had been established at Camp David. A framework had been established which would permit all interested parties, including the Palestinians, to co-operate in solving the problems of the region; it would safeguard the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and enable the definitive status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to be negotiated. Nevertheless, a concerted campaign was being waged against the only existing and viable plan to achieve peace in the Middle East. Peace could not be achieved through the adoption of tendentious resolutions in the United Nations. His delegation also condemned all acts of intimidation and violence designed to discourage Palestinian participation in the peace process.

24. The Palestine Liberation Organization opposed the Camp David agreements because accepting them meant recognition of Israel. The unification of Palestine was a euphemism whose aim was to eliminate Israel and assimilate its territory into a Palestinian Arab State. Furthermore, the agreements explicitly repudiated the

/...

(Mr. Lichenstein, United States of America)

threat or use of force, methods used by PLO. For example, in 1977, after President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem, PLO had threatened the lives and property of persons who had demonstrated in favour of Sadat's initiative. In November and December 1980, 12 persons who had taken a moderate position had been assassinated in the Gaza Strip. It was ironic that many States had expressed concern over the Israeli practices in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip while remaining silent about the violence and intimidation practised by PLO. His delegation noted that the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel were just the first signs that there was a possibility for Israel and its neighbours to reach a peaceful settlement and achieve a just solution to the Palestinian problem. The Special Committee's report, on the other hand, did not contribute to the cause of human rights or the cause of peace.

25. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that each delegation was free to interpret the Camp David agreements in accordance with its own principles and views. Some had stated that the agreements were not the right way to restore peace; others that they were obstacles to peace. His delegation respected those opinions even though it unfortunately did not entirely share them. There were those in the international community who thought that the Camp David agreements presented a positive framework which was in keeping with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and which permitted the liberation of a territory dear to the Arabs, namely, the Sinai Peninsula. What mattered was that two parties to the conflict in the Middle East, Egypt and Israel, were convinced that they had taken the proper course. Egypt would pursue the efforts toward peace which had already started, without prejudice to the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of a Palestinian State. History alone would bear witness to the peace process.

26. He referred to the observation concerning his country made by the representative of Syria and explained that Egypt was part of the Arab nation and would never disagree with its Arab brothers. For more than 30 years Egypt had fought for the Arab cause, given asylum to many peoples and sacrificed thousands of martyrs. The Government of Egypt had never opposed the ideas of other countries and had always been open to proposals from its Arab brothers. Furthermore, many Egyptians were living in other Arab countries. Hence, the isolation referred to existed only in the mind of the representative of Syria.

27. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq), referring to the statement of the United States representative, who had remarked that his Government had opposed the establishment of the Special Committee because the Committee had been requested to limit its work to examining the situation of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, recalled that the item under consideration concerned the rights of the Arab population of the Israeli-occupied territories, or territories occupied by the Zionist forces. It was not a question of examining the situation of minorities living in other countries, for example, the Jewish minorities in the United States.

28. The representative of the United States had also said that it was obscene to compare zionism and nazism. The first person to draw the parallel between the two

/...

(Mr. Al-Zahawi, Iraq)

concepts had been none other than Winston Churchill in 1944. Arnold Toynbee had been of the opinion that the killings carried out by Irgun had been comparable to the crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis. The Jewish philosopher Martin Buber had referred to the lessons learned by zionism from Hitler. Similarly, in a letter to Moshe Menuhin, Israel Shahak had expressed his fear at the link that he had seen between nazism and zionism. The obscenity, therefore, existed solely in the minds of the Zionists and their supporters.

29. He wondered what the Camp David agreements were supposed to have done for the population of the occupied territories. In conclusion, he quoted an article by the respected United States diplomat, George W. Ball, published in The Washington Post. In his article, the former Secretary of State warned that it was urgent for the United States to redefine its relations with Israel. He (Mr. Al-Zahawi) urged the United States Government to follow that policy.

30. Mr. HAMDI (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that although some friendly, peace-loving countries had shown solidarity with the Arab countries in the face of Israeli practices contrary to the principles of human rights, it was regrettable that other countries, under Israeli influence, had given those policies uncritical support. The statements of the Zionist Government to the effect that it had very precise plans to take over Palestine, to expand into other countries, and to dominate commercial activity, which was the backbone of a country, and the means of communication, were well known. Israel, claiming to have a democratic government, had launched a campaign of repression against the Palestinian people, though without succeeding in imposing its rule. The Zionist regime was demented and was seeking to impose its views on the Palestinian people by force, in which it would never succeed.

31. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had been surprised to hear the United States representative defend the treacherous Camp David agreements, which the Palestinian people, who had been exiled and their land occupied, regarded as having been imposed on them and which they consequently rejected. In that context, it should be noted that the Arab peoples would seek to destroy those agreements in order to end United States hegemony in the area.

32. Mercenaries and agents had invaded Arab territories, defending zionism and Judaism, seeking to take over the area. They talked about human rights and peace, but they should not accuse other Governments, for they violated those very rights. He stressed that the Camp David agreements had been reached against the will of the Palestinian people.

33. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States representative had not been present when the representative of Israel had said that he was proud of his Government's policy: it was precisely that policy of violating human rights in the occupied territories to which the report of the Special Committee referred. It might have been hoped that the United States would express general approval of the Special Committee's report. Instead, the

/...

(Mr. Shamma, Jordan)

representative of that Government had painted a favourable picture of the Camp David agreements. It should be stressed that in the view of the Jordanian Government, the Camp David agreements constituted simply a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Nevertheless, as far as the rights of the Palestinian people were concerned, the agreement was an attempt to undermine them. In the light of United States support for Israel, it might be asked how far the United States had contributed to the sufferings of the Palestinian people and to what was currently happening in the occupied territories.

34. President Sadat had once said that the Israelis suffered from fear and mistrust and that his trip to Jerusalem had eliminated that psychological barrier. Although Egypt was no longer Israel's adversary, fear and mistrust continued to be instruments of Israeli policy: the United States was providing it with aircraft and weapons. The military, material and moral support afforded by the United States was the *raison d'être* for Israeli intransigence and for the campaign launched by Israel against the rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied Territories. Thus, President Sadat had been wrong, for fear and mistrust were an integral part of the Zionist political ideology, both domestically and at the international level. In the light of the material and moral support of Israel by the United States, the question must be asked whether United States interests in fact coincided with Israeli practices, though not necessarily with the backing of Washington. The United States representative had claimed that the report of the Special Committee was not conclusive. That was a mere excuse, worse even than that of the Zionist representative.

35. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the representative of the new United States Government seemed to be unaware of various reports on human rights that had been published by the House Committee on International Affairs. In one of those reports, it was said that, under the emergency regulations, damage caused by the military to people and property did not constitute a violation of human rights, but rather that the occupying forces were entitled to apply the law as they saw fit. That was a reflection of Israeli policy. Apparently the United States representative had not read the reports put out by his own Congress.

36. An example highlighting the sectarianism of the Zionist fanatics was the fact that in arithmetic textbooks for schools the internationally recognized cross used for the plus sign, had been replaced by an inverted "T." Israel must surely be the only country in the world where fanaticism was taken to such extremes.

37. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that to counter the quotations used by the representative of Iraq he would like to add a quotation from a statement by the President of Iraq, Mr. Saddam Hussein, who had said, according to an Associated Press report: "Conquest confers new rights; the longer a nation stays in a territory, the more rights it gains. War creates additional rights, over and above pre-war rights."

/...

38. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt) said that he would have preferred the Syrian representative not to withdraw from the Committee room but to be able to listen to Egypt's comments, as he had listened to those of Syria. He had listened with surprise to the intemperate, sentimental and indeed rather morbid statements of the Syrian representative, after the representative of Saudi Arabia had warned against that kind of invective.

39. He did not intend to descend to the same level, and wished merely to reiterate that the Camp David agreements did not in any way represent betrayal or capitulation; on the other hand, the occupation of the Golan Heights did represent capitulation to invasion. Nevertheless, he wished to say, out of a desire for solidarity, that he hoped the day would come when the Israelis would evacuate the Golan Heights.

40. Regarding the remarks of the Jordanian representative, he said that history would be the sole judge. Only God could call men to account: President Sadat had lived in obedience to his principles and had died defending them.

41. Mr. HUBAREZ (Yemen) said that his delegation was concerned at the statements made by the representative of the United States in support of the Israeli policy of terrorism in the occupied Arab territories. The United States must assume its international responsibility; the military assistance which it was providing to Israel had adverse repercussions on the Libyan and Palestinian peoples and was therefore far from consistent with the defence of human rights. On the contrary, its policy of supporting Israel was the chief factor encouraging Israel to continue its policy of settlements in the occupied territories.

42. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America) said that he would reply to the various speakers who had leveled charges, made allegations or distorted the meaning of his previous statement. One speaker had questioned the relevance of referring to the living conditions of Jewish minorities in other countries. The reference in question reflected a position long held by the Government of the United States and maintained under successive administrations. It was not a matter of comparing the human rights violations committed in one place with those allegedly committed in another place in order to establish which were worse or better. Human rights were universal and fundamental rights, essential for leading a good life in conditions of freedom. The United States was concerned about the situation of Jewish minorities in other countries just as it was genuinely concerned about the situation of those Palestinians whose rights had on some occasions undoubtedly been violated. However, it was also concerned about the terrorist acts which violated the human rights of Palestinian moderates and the assassination of some of them on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. All those acts constituted violations of basic human rights and, as such, were reprehensible and called for outright condemnation by his Government, which deplored all such violations. The United States would spare no efforts to bring about conditions in which such violations did not occur.

43. Another speaker had quoted from a long and notable list of authors in defence of the purported similarity between nazism and zionism, which could only be described as obscene. To quote those who, however eminent they might be, had formulated an obscene theory did not detract in the slightest from the obscenity of the theory.

/...

(Mr. Lichenstein, United States of America)

44. Another representative had stated that human rights were violated in the United States of America. It was true; they were; that was a deplorable situation which could not in any way be condoned. At the same time, however, it must be stressed that everyone in the territory of the United States, whether they were citizens, residents or aliens, or even accused of crimes, however terrible the crime might be, had free access to the courts and to due process of law. The United States was proud of that system and did not consider that it was called upon to defend it in any way.

45. Another speaker had claimed that the representative of the United States had stated that the report of the Special Committee was inconclusive. He had never made such a statement; on the other hand, he had stated that the report of the Special Committee was incomplete, partial, tendentious, partisan, selective, based on questionable sources of information and, in short, consisted exclusively of sterile recriminations which did not serve the cause either of human rights or of peace.

46. Another speaker had claimed that the representative of the United States had stated that the Camp David peace process would guarantee peace in the Middle East and that it was synonymous with peace. On the contrary, he had taken the utmost care, speaking on behalf of his Government, to describe the Camp David peace process as such, namely, as a series of actions aimed at achieving peace and as requiring negotiations and deliberations which his Government sincerely hoped would restore to the Palestinian people their legitimate rights and ensure their enjoyment thereof. The Camp David process was only a path towards peace open to all those who wished to take it.

47. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq), speaking for the second time in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had claimed to quote President Saddam Hussein. The Zionists were notorious for their tergiversations. Prime Minister Begin himself had attributed to President Saddam Hussein statements which the latter had never made, and had subsequently been obliged to retract. Although he did not have the text of the quotation, he could safely affirm, without knowing what President Saddam Hussein had actually said, that it did not confer upon Israel any right to usurp the lands of Palestine or to expel its population and condemn it to eternal exile.

48. The representative of the United States had referred to Jewish minorities in other countries. The Committee was currently considering the implementation of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Were the words of the representative of the United States to be interpreted as an attempt to apply that Convention within the national borders of a State? He suggested that the representative of the United States might weigh his words more carefully when discussing the legal norms of international law.

49. The same representative of the United States had also expressed his concern about various types of abuse and acts of terrorism committed against some Palestinians. He had obviously been referring to acts committed by patriots to defend themselves against hired assassins collaborating with the oppressors. The

/...

(Mr. Al-Zahawi, Iraq)

representative of the United States had not made any reference at all to the Jewish settler "Vigilantes," who included many Jewish citizens of the United States. What was that country doing to curb the excesses of those militias? The Palestinians were merely trying to defend themselves against the abuses and outrages of which they were victims.

50. On 17 November 1944, Winston Churchill had stated before the House of Commons that zionism was producing a new class of terrorists and delinquents and that many people, including himself, would be obliged to reconsider their hitherto favourable position; he had added that, for there to be any hope of a peaceful future for zionism, those terrorist activities must cease and those responsible must be rooted out. Unfortunately, those very people had now risen to positions of national leadership.

51. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking for the second time in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Iraq had tried to find many quotations without being able to find that of his own President, which was reported in an Associated Press dispatch of 4 November 1980. That was typical of those who refused to face up to reality; when something was unpleasant, they simply denied its existence. Another solution was to walk out in order to avoid having to listen to the other side, as the representative Iraq had done for the second time in the Committee, after having also walked out of the plenam General Assembly. Obviously, there were some people who wished to take the easy way out; the best way was sometimes the most difficult, but those who sought the easy way did not seem willing to make the effort.

52. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking for the second time in exercise of the right of reply, said that, if the United States supported the right to live in peace, that was precisely what the Palestinians wanted; however, the Camp David accords did not guarantee that freedom for the Palestinians, deprived them of their right to return to their homes and to recover their property and did not ensure their right to free determination. Under those accords, Israel was not asked to withdraw from all the occupied territories, even though that had been unanimously decided by the Security Council. The Camp David accords did not open the way to peace but were a means of perpetuating the Israeli military presence in the occupied territories and were therefore the road to war.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded the general debate on item

64. Amendments to draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.20, L.23 and L.24 would be issued.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.18

54. Mr. SASTROHANDOYO (Indonesia) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, India, Madagascar, Maldives, Malaysia, Mali, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and his own country. He explained that the text was similar to the resolutions adopted in previous years because the reason for them--the occupation of Arab territories by Israel--continued to exist.

/...

Draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.19 and L.24

55. Mrs. IKRAMULLAH (Pakistan) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.19 and L.24 and read out some of the preambular and operative paragraphs.

Draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.20, L.21, L.22 and L.23

56. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.20, L.21, L.22 and L.23, adding that his country's opinions on the subject had always been very clearly stated and that the contents and objectives of the draft resolutions were well known to the members of the Committee. He read out some of the preambular and operative paragraphs.

57. With respect to draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.20, he pointed out that the operative paragraphs would have to be renumbered starting from paragraph 7. With respect to draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.22, the words "under . . . Israeli military occupation" in the first preambular paragraph should be changed to read "under illegal Israeli military occupation." In the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1, 3 and 4, the references to "occupied Syrian" territory should read "occupied Syrian Arab" territory. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.23 were the following: Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Indonesia and Pakistan.

58. His delegation regretted that there was an error in the list of sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.20, L.21, L.22 and L.23 and the names of the United Arab Emirates, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritania should therefore be deleted.

59. Finally, the objective of all those draft resolutions was to promote peace. His delegation therefore hoped that they would obtain wide-ranging support.

60. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that on 2 June 1980, three persons had been seriously wounded in explosions that had taken place in Judea and Samaria. Two were the mayors of Nablus and Ramallah and the third was a member of the Israeli police who had saved the life of the mayor of Al-Bireh. The people of Israel had emphatically condemned those acts of terrorism and the Government had ordered an intensive investigation. His country's outrage at those acts of terror derived from its position of principle concerning terrorism in all its manifestations.

61. Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.24 raised serious questions of morality and double standards. Over the past decade PLO had contributed in a decisive degree, to international terrorism by providing assistance, training, logistic support and shelter to other terrorist organizations which had operated in different parts of the globe. Responsible Governments had taken measures to cope with that danger threatening society but they had not been successful in eradicating the phenomenon in their own countries. Israel had acted with firmness and determination in combatting terrorism, although it had been impossible to provide fool-proof protection against the incessant attacks of the PLO terrorists. The professed concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution for the well-being and security of

/...

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

the residents of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District would have been more credible if their Governments had not ignored the numerous PLO murders and attempted assassinations of Arabs in those areas. For example, PLO had taken responsibility for the assassination, on 17 November, of Yusuf Al-Khatib and his son Katim. Nevertheless, the sponsors of the draft resolution had not shown any concern for that brutal act.

62. Since 1966, PLO terrorism had claimed the lives of some 400 Arabs and wounded 2,000 others. All the victims of PLO had been guilty of only one sin: openly supporting peaceful coexistence with Israel. He emphasized again that his Government condemned terrorism in all its forms. The acts of terror against the Arab mayors on 2 June 1980 had evoked a widespread revulsion in Israel. The investigation would continue until the criminals had been discovered, apprehended and brought to justice.

63. Mrs. IKRAMULLAH (Pakistan) agreed with the representative of Israel that terrorism was not a phenomenon restricted to Palestine alone. Nevertheless, Israel did not appear to have done anything yet to find the persons guilty of the acts of terrorism committed against the mayors of Nablus, Rammalah and Al-Bireh.

64. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that there was a typographical error in the English version of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.24. The quotation in the second preambular paragraph should end after the suspension points in the third line; the three remaining lines should become the third preambular paragraph.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that it would not be possible to vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee until their financial implications had been determined.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.