

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 750th  
MEETING**



Friday, 11 December 1970,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS  
(Afghanistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 101**

**Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (continued) (A/8089, A/8164, A/SPC/142, A/SPC/L.201)**

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/SPC/L.201, which had just been circulated, and announced that Indonesia, Mali and Senegal had now been added to the list of sponsors.

2. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) paid a tribute to the work done by the three members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, which was all the more appreciable in view of the campaign of intimidation to which their Governments and they themselves had been subjected by the Israeli representative. Ceylon, Somalia and Yugoslavia were loyal Members of the United Nations, whose contribution to the principles of the Charter and the activities of the Organization was a shining record which could not be dimmed by any statements by the Israeli representative. It was disturbing that Israeli attacks on the three members of the Special Committee appeared to propound a new doctrine: that if a State upheld the principles of the Charter, its citizens were automatically disqualified from being members of a United Nations committee because they were considered to be lacking in objectivity.

3. Many resolutions adopted by United Nations organs had expressed grave concern for the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the Arab territories still under the military occupation of Israel. The Special Committee had been established by the General Assembly to investigate Israel's violations of the basic rights and fundamental freedoms of the populations of those territories. Despite Israel's refusal to co-operate and to allow it to enter the occupied territories, the Special Committee felt that it had ascertained the degree to which the policies and practices referred to in General Assembly resolutions 2443 (XXIII) and 2546 (XXIV) existed and had made certain recommendations in order to facilitate the termination and prevention of such policies.

4. The Special Committee's work symbolized the fact that the international community had not forsaken the population of the occupied territories. Israel, having violated the Arab people's basic rights to peace by committing aggres-

sion in June 1967 and having continued its occupation of Arab territories in violation of the Charter and the United Nations resolutions, had also disregarded the norms of humanitarian law for the protection of the civilian inhabitants in armed conflicts. In 1868, the Declaration of St. Petersburg had defined its aim as to conciliate the necessity of war with the laws of humanity. Section III of the Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War adopted by the Hague Peace Conference in 1899 was considered the nucleus of a system of protection for the inhabitants of occupied territories. The Judgement of the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal on 10 October 1946 had stated that those regulations had been recognized by all civilized nations and were regarded as governing the laws and customs of war. The Charter of the United Nations had prohibited the use of force. Those who resorted to war committed aggression, a crime against humanity which was further aggravated when it was coupled with gross violations of the basic rights and fundamental freedoms of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, as was the case in those occupied by Israel.

5. Account had been taken of the experience of the Second World War to develop the humanitarian law of armed conflicts when the diplomatic conference organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross had adopted in August 1949 the four Geneva Conventions for the Protection of the Victims of War. The fourth of those Conventions relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was, as the Special Committee said in paragraph 41 of its report (A/8089), the expression of the international community's sense of revulsion at the treatment accorded to Jews who came under the Nazi régime. It was ironical that the first time the value of that Convention could be put to the test was during and after the June 1967 war between Israel and its neighbouring Arab countries.

6. The Special Committee had obtained extensive evidence concerning infringements of the rights of persons living in the occupied areas and above all of their right to return home. Forcible deportation, ranging from open compulsion to mere discouragement, had become the policy of the occupying Power in all the Territories under its military control. Reports by the Red Cross also confirmed that efforts at repatriation had been hindered by the Israeli Government.

7. The Special Committee's report listed six types of violation affecting the safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. The first was collective and area punishment, which constituted a grave violation of article 33 of the fourth Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and which was described in issue number 114 of the International Review of the Red

Cross published in September 1970, as well as in the evidence collected by the Committee. Statements by Israeli leaders showed that collective punishment was a definite policy. The second violation—deportation and expulsion—was contrary to article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention. The third, ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees, was prohibited by article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as by articles 31 and 32 of the fourth Geneva Convention. The Special Committee had heard several witnesses on the subject and the above-mentioned September 1970 issue of the *International Review of the Red Cross* stated that the International Committee of the Red Cross representatives had been unable to visit the military camps where most of the detainees were held. Several witnesses, including ministers, archbishops and senators, had testified concerning the fourth and fifth violations—the ill-treatment of civilians, on the one hand, and destruction and demolition of houses, confiscation and expropriation of property on the other. Looting and pillage, the sixth violation, were prohibited by article 33 of the fourth Geneva Convention and the report of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Gussing, had said that it was reasonably sure that the Israeli forces were largely responsible for the extensive looting of the town of Kuneitra.<sup>1</sup>

8. The Special Committee had established Israel's violations of the basic norms of humanitarian international law on the basis of documented and conclusive evidence, including the testimony of eye-witnesses and statements by members of the Israeli Government and other political leaders. The United Nations had a solemn responsibility to face up to Israel's disregard of the elementary rules of national conduct. The course of action before the General Assembly and the remedy for that grave situation were contained in the Special Committee's recommendations in chapter IV of its report.

9. The Special Committee, in the first stage of its work, had concentrated on evidence that had an immediate bearing on the types of violations of human rights specified in the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Further work by the Committee would therefore be necessary in order for it to complete its mandate. The General Assembly should direct the Committee to continue its work and request the Secretary-General to provide it with all the necessary facilities for the continued performance of its task.

10. Mr. OULD HACHEME (Mauritania) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/L.201 on behalf of the sponsors. There should be no difficulty in adopting it because its recommendations were based on documents already endorsed by competent organs of the United Nations.

11. The preambular paragraphs listed the previous United Nations decisions relating to the question. Operative paragraph 1 referred to the Special Committee—whose work could not be completed because of the opposition of the Israeli Government—and expressed appreciation of its efforts. Operative paragraph 2 called on the Government of Israel to implement the Special Committee's recommenda-

tions and comply with its obligations under various international instruments. If the United Nations was faithful to its principles, there could be no difficulty in adopting such a provision; the same was true of operative paragraph 3. Operative paragraph 4 urged the Government of Israel to co-operate with the Special Committee. If United Nations decisions were to have any real meaning, it was high time to call to account countries like Israel that trampled those decisions underfoot. Operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 were self-explanatory and should not give rise to any difficulties, since the wording was based on General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII).

12. The basic aim of the draft resolution was the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related international instruments. He had been in the Third Committee recently when several delegations had expressed indignation that the question of establishing a United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights had been postponed until the twenty-sixth session. Yet that was hardly surprising, in view of what was happening with the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the fact that Israel had refused to co-operate with the Special Committee. If the United Nations wanted progress in the field of human rights, it must make a real effort to defend them, and make full use of the machinery that already existed. He appealed to the Special Political Committee to give its whole-hearted support to the draft resolution.

13. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that the General Assembly's decision to establish the Special Committee was fully justified. That was confirmed by the work of the Committee in investigating the situation of the victims of the Israeli aggression of 1967 and by the comprehensive data which the Committee, despite the obstacles placed in its path by the Israeli Government, had reflected in its report. Being based entirely on evidence from authoritative organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Israel League for Human and Civil Rights, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the Governments of a number of Arab States, as well as that of individuals, the report was a revealing document of historic importance. As part of the documentation of the session at which the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations was commemorated, it had enhanced the authority of the Organization.

14. It was well known what an insidious campaign Israel had organized during the twenty-third session of the General Assembly against the idea of establishing a Special Committee, an idea which had been put forward at the International Conference on Human Rights held at Teheran in 1968.<sup>2</sup> It was now known what additional difficulties the Committee had faced on the part of the Israeli authorities and what provocations its members had been subjected to in the performance of their task. Her delegation joined with those which had already expressed their deep gratitude to the members of the Committee, and would press for the continuation of its mandate until its task was fully completed.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967*, document S/8158, para. 33.

<sup>2</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), chapter III, resolution I.

15. Her delegation had been struck by the objective way in which the report described the repression and flouting of elementary human rights and the torture and indignities committed against the Arabs who had been arrested and detained. Mass punitive collective actions against the peaceful civilian population in the Arab territories occupied by Israel had cost the lives of thousands of persons. Those actions, according to the report and to press data, had resulted in 1967 in the destruction of 7,000 houses, the death of 5,000 peaceful inhabitants, and more than 16,000 wounded. If to that was added the inhuman tortures and mediaeval inquisitions of those arrested and detained, a clear picture emerged of the oppressive, Fascist-type régime of the Israeli Government.

16. If the report of the Special Committee was disseminated, it would serve not only as a revealing document but as a means of mobilizing world public opinion in the active defence of the human rights of the Arab population under Israeli occupation. The report should awaken the conscience of all peoples to whom the freedom of the individual was dear.

17. It would be difficult for the Israeli leaders and official United Nations representatives to evade the facts in the Special Committee's report. They could not deny even the few cases of crimes against the Arab population which were adduced in the report.

18. During the recent debates held in the Committee on the question of Palestine refugees, the Israeli representative had tried to justify all the oppressive measures against the Arab population by some supposed threat to the existence of Israel. The same argument had been used the previous day on television by President Nixon to justify the United States bombing of North Viet-Nam. But no such threat to security had materialized during the twenty years of the existence of the State of Israel. On the contrary it was Israel alone, with the help, of course, of its overseas protectors, which had committed aggressive acts against the neighbouring Arab States. As a result of those wars it was not Israeli, but Arab territory which had been seized; all the false allegations about a supposed threat to Israel's existence were used by the Zionist leaders as a justification for their expansionist, racist policy and the attempt at israelization of large areas of the Middle East.

19. Was there not a surprising similarity between the policies of the ruling circles of Israel and the actions of the Nazis against the European countries thirty years ago? The same pretexts of a supposed threat to security had been made both with respect to the Hitlerite attack on European territories and with respect to the aggressive acts of Israel against the Arab countries. But there was also a striking likeness in the methods of dealing with the victims of the aggression and the population of the territory occupied by the aggressor. Recently the representative of Syria had drawn a parallel between the crimes of the Nazis, the crimes of the Israeli Zionists and the mass crimes of the United States troops against the peaceful civilian population at Song My and My Lai. The nature of oppressive régimes was the same everywhere.

20. A threat to the Israeli régime could only be caused by the prospect of an internal break-up of the Zionist,

chauvinistic régime and of the expansionist policy of the present Israeli Government, since nobody was threatening the State of Israel as such from outside. The Zionist, militarist régime of Israel was being increasingly threatened by the growing internal resistance of the Israeli workers and the democratic forces in the country. The Israeli workers had to pay very dearly for the military operations of the Israeli troops, and for the maintenance for so many years of a permanent war psychosis and tension in the whole Middle East region. It was no secret that Israel, as a result of its aggressive policy, had become the country with the largest external debt, amounting in October 1970 to \$2,800 million; and \$5 million was to be added to the debt. To cover that debt the Israeli State would require from each family \$1.968 in taxes. The war against the Arab States also involved human victims among the Israeli people itself in addition to the increasing material difficulties. That was the real threat to Israel. Not some external threat from the Arab States, but zionism itself, and the expansionist policy of the present régime, was the most dangerous enemy of the Israeli people.

21. Her delegation was convinced that the internal resistance of the Israeli workers, together with the just national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples against the régime of the pro-imperialist Government of Israel, was one of the most hopeful factors for a just political settlement of the whole Middle East conflict.

22. In that respect the Special Committee's report was a valuable contribution to the joint struggle of the peoples of the Middle East to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by establishing a just peace and lasting co-operation among them on the basis of mutual respect and avoidance of the use of force in the settlement of disputes. Her delegation considered that draft resolution A/SPC/L.201 would promote the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and therefore would vote for it.

23. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that the report of the Special Committee recorded a procession of misfortunes characteristic of war. His delegation was grieved that the territories of its Arab brothers were still under military occupation despite Security Council resolution 242 (1967). As early as 7 June 1967, the ruler of his country had declared that the time when countries could occupy and retain the territories of other countries had passed and that arrangements must be made in order to return the usurped territories as soon as possible.

24. The emphasis in the debate on the problem in the Special Political Committee differed from that in debates in the General Assembly. While the Assembly stressed the political aspects of the Middle East problem, the Committee was dealing with purely humanitarian questions. It was imperative that the principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the pertinent 1949 Geneva Convention should be applied. Respect for human rights was essential for the equilibrium and progress of the whole of the international community. It could not, however, be forgotten that the denial of human rights was a consequence of occupation and could only be rectified by termination of that occupation in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations. Every effort must

be made to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which provided the framework for a solution to the situation resulting from the 1967 conflict. His delegation had supported the resumption of the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and believed that every effort should be made to ensure that Ambassador Jarring could resume his mission in the very near future. Furthermore, pending an over-all solution to the problem, the United Nations should do its utmost to alleviate the consequences of the 1967 war, particularly in the occupied territories.

25. His delegation would vote for draft resolution A/SPC/L.201, which was of a humanitarian nature, as it had voted for similar draft resolutions in other organs of the United Nations.

26. Miss DINCER (Turkey) said that she wished to join those who had expressed their appreciation to the Special Committee for the way it had accomplished its difficult task in the most unfavourable circumstances. Turkey had voted for General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) by which the Special Committee had been established.

27. Since June 1967, in all its official pronouncements the Turkish Government had stated its refusal to recognize territorial acquisition through the use of force and had condemned Israel's attempts to change the status of Jerusalem through *faits accomplis*. It considered that Israel's occupation of Arab territories and its non-compliance with United Nations resolutions constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. The main objective of the international community should be to establish a just and lasting peace, which was the surest guarantee of human rights. It therefore deplored Israel's refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee and hoped that co-operation would be forthcoming in the near future.

28. It fully supported the recommendations of the Special Committee and, in particular, the conclusions that the fundamental violation of human rights lay in the very fact of occupation and that the ideal manner in which violations would cease would clearly be by the termination of the occupation itself (A/8089, para. 146).

29. Her delegation considered that there was an urgent need for a workable mechanism for safeguarding the human rights of the populations of the occupied territories and considered that the rights of the innocent people living under military occupation was a matter for international concern. It was essential to find a solution to the problem in order to put an end to the suffering of those who had been evicted from their homes and were living under foreign occupation.

30. Mr. LORCH (Israel) said that at the 748th meeting his delegation had fully explained its position with regard to the Special Committee. During its deliberations the Committee had heard many statements in support of the Special Committee. The number of favourable statements merely reflected the fact that the League of Arab States had fourteen members which of course supported the Special Committee and that the Soviet bloc had 10 votes in the United Nations and would support anything which was

damaging to Israel. Other countries, such as Iran, maintained special relations with the Arab States and would therefore vote along with the Arabs against Israel. The abundance of praise from such sources might cast doubts on the impartiality of the Committee. Furthermore, whilst there might be safety in numbers, it was sometimes the lone voice which spoke the truth.

31. No one had attempted to contradict the contents of his statement at the 748th meeting. No one had claimed that the representative of Somalia, whose country was at war with Israel, could be objective about his enemies or that the representatives of Ceylon and Yugoslavia could be impartial. No one had denied that the procedure adopted by the Special Committee was unacceptable by all international standards, or that the Special Committee had suppressed evidence which was favourable towards Israel and accepted as sacrosanct evidence which was false. His delegation therefore stood by the conclusions it had reached at the 748th meeting that the composition of the Special Committee was biased and partial, that its procedure would be unacceptable to any court of law and that any resolution embodying its politically biased recommendations was unacceptable.

32. Those countries which were at war with Israel would support the recommendations and the prolongation of the mandate of the Special Committee, and use them as a weapon against Israel in the Arab propaganda war. He would however appeal to other States to consider carefully whether blanket acceptance of such recommendations and of the perpetuation of the Special Committee were in the best interests of human rights and the United Nations itself. If they did not feel that human rights were best served by blind acceptance of allegations and that it was in the interests of human rights for an evidently biased body to continue in existence, they should have the courage of their convictions and vote against the draft resolution rather than merely abstain.

33. His delegation had never claimed that occupation was pleasant or that the Israeli authorities were faultless. Yet the way to end occupation was not by contributing to Arab propaganda. The occupation would automatically cease to exist when the conflict was settled and just and lasting peace established. Members of the Committee should not create a climate of hatred and acrimony between Jews and Arabs but should promote understanding and willingness to negotiate and co-exist. Extension of the mandate of the Special Committee and acceptance of its recommendations did not contribute to that cause.

34. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that the draft resolution under consideration recalled the binding international instruments and principles and resolutions of the United Nations. It further called for the continuation of the investigation of practices of which there was *prima facie* evidence and sought to provide the General Assembly with an opportunity to examine the results of forthcoming investigations. In the meantime it called upon Israel to co-operate with the investigation machinery and to comply with the international conventions to which it was a party and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which laid down the general standards for civilized conduct. It also required it to ensure the application of those standards

to the case at hand and to comply with the recommendations of the Special Committee, which were based on those standards.

35. The representative of Israel had argued that praise from certain groups of delegations was in itself a condemnation of the Special Committee. For his part, he wished to remind the Committee that it was not those delegations which had praised the Special Committee that stood before the international community accused of violations of international law and human rights but the State of Israel. Furthermore, in accordance with the logic of the representative of Israel it also followed that condemnation of the Special Committee by Israel was tantamount to genuine praise.

36. The findings of the Special Committee were corroborated by and in turn corroborated those of other international groups such as the Special Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights, UNRWA, the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International and the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The Israeli representative's condemnation of the work of the Special Committee thus constituted a defiance of the entire international community.

37. He therefore wished to address an appeal to the silent segment of the Committee. He fully recognized the right to silence and the reason for the silence of many delegations, but stressed that they had been challenged by Israel. Their silence had been interpreted either as approval of the practices of Israel in the territories which it occupied, as lack of interest in the human rights of the civilians in those territories or as disapproval of the principle of investigation of suspect practices. It was also construed as disapproval of the Special Committee, its mandate—which had been decided by the General Assembly—its composition—which had been approved by Members of the United Nations—and its methodology. He therefore urged members to take part in the vote on the draft resolution, and by so doing, to express their positions. It was impossible to be uninterested in human rights. The entire philosophy of the United Nations was that, if the machinery for safeguarding human rights was still defective and so long as it was not possible to uphold the human rights of all mankind, at least it was necessary to turn the spotlight on situations where violations of human rights occurred. Members should therefore support the principle of investigating alleged violations of human rights.

38. Furthermore, many of those who had remained silent had experienced foreign occupation either in a classical colonial guise or, as far as the European countries were concerned, during the Second World War. They were in a position to understand the task of the Special Committee. In particular, the European nations should reaffirm their adherence to the convictions which, following the Second World War, had prompted them to rally to the diplomatic conference from which the Geneva Conventions of 1949 had issued. Their purpose in so doing had been to build an international order in which the experiences of the Second World War could not be repeated. If they did not now show the same concern for the fate of the Palestinians, they would stand accused of discrimination and prejudice.

39. He fully agreed with the representative of Israel that members should take an active part in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.201. They should vote in such a way as to endorse the principles of human rights, the sanctity of international conventions and the duty of the United Nations to investigate violations of both.

40. Mr. LORCH (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he would not reply fully to the attempt made to identify an abstention from voting or a negative vote on the draft resolution with a lack of interest in human rights. Those who were really interested in human rights should do all they could to respect the human rights of all those in the area of conflict, instead of identifying themselves with one side. The representative of Kuwait had not referred to the many recommendations of the Special Committee, which included a call to Israel to desist from a number of non-existent practices, and to carry out the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which the report misquoted and distorted. He wished to point out to the fairminded members of the Committee that Israel was applying the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention; that was shown by the testimony of Mr. Claude Pilloud of the International Committee of the Red Cross, in document A/AC.145/RT.36. Israel had reserved its position concerning the application of the Convention, on formal and legitimate grounds, and Mr. Pilloud, when asked if that reservation interfered with the application of the Convention, or with the functions of his Committee in relation to the Convention, had replied that the Convention was, with minimal reservations, respected by Israel. He regretted that the Red Cross should be dragged into an acrimonious dispute, but it had already been referred to in the draft resolution. The Red Cross had, deservedly, the respect of all parties to the conflict.

41. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that part of his country was now occupied by Israel, which was sufficient justification for his wish to reply to Colonel Lorch. He used the military title advisedly, as he wished to introduce Colonel Lorch to the Special Political Committee as a military historian, and as the author of a book containing an account of a plan for applying pressure in order to expel the Arab population from upper Palestine in 1948. Colonel Lorch, as a historian, should have read Nos. 113 and 114 of the International Review of the Red Cross, published by the International Committee of the Red Cross, for August and September 1970 respectively, to which he himself had referred at the 747th meeting. Everything in them substantiated what the Special Committee had said in its report. The representative of Kuwait had referred to a number of other reports by international bodies corroborating the many crimes of Israel in violating human rights. In No. 113 of the above-mentioned Review, the International Committee for the Red Cross has said that, in connexion with article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention, the International Committee delegation had tried, as early as 1967, to stop pressure being exerted to force the Arab inhabitants of the Golan heights to leave them for other parts of Syria. He appealed both to the Committee, and to Colonel Lorch as a historian, to read those documents. Colonel Lorch had claimed that the practices Israel was asked to desist from were non-existent; the speaker referred to paragraph 1 of Security Council resolution 237 (1967), calling on Israel to

ensure the safety of the inhabitants where military operations had taken place and facilitate the return of those who had fled the areas, and pointed out that that resolution had been adopted unanimously by all the members of the Security Council. Since then General Assembly resolutions 2252 (ES-V) and 2452 A (XXIII) had been adopted, both by over 100 votes. Israel's statement was merely a cynical attempt to draw attention away from the violation of human rights for which it was being called to account.

42. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, if the practices that the Special Committee's recommendations called on Israel to desist from were indeed non-existent, then it was to Israel's advantage to co-operate with that international investigative body to prove as much. The investigation was not for or against Israel, but purely for the truth. Furthermore, he asked how the Israeli representative's statement that Israel was complying with the Geneva Conventions could be reconciled with the admission of his superiors that the occupation authorities had deported civilians from the occupied territories, had destroyed property, had imposed collective punishment, and had built settlements in occupied territory, all in violation of the Geneva Conventions.

43. Mr. LORCH (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the question that the Committee must decide at its next meeting was whether to extend the mandate of a committee consisting of one country that had declared itself at war with Israel, and two countries that had adopted a position directly opposed to that of Israel, one of them, in fact, having said that Israel should cease to exist. The question was whether the continued existence of such a body served the cause of human rights and of the United Nations.

44. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Israel had refused to co-operate with other bodies of different composition, and had announced that it would not co-operate with the Special Committee before its composition was known; Israel had also said it would not recognize the Secretary-General's representative even before he had been appointed. Thus the question was not the composition of the Special Committee, but the fact that Israel refused to accept the principle of international scrutiny of its behaviour in the occupied territories where it was bound to comply with the international instruments to which it was a party.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*