

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 853<sup>rd</sup>

MEETING

Wednesday, 6 December 1972,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Hady TOURÉ (Guinea).

## AGENDA ITEM 42

**Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (*continued*) (A/8828, A/SPC/158, A/SPC/L.258)**

1. Mr. BABAA (Libyan Arab Republic) expressed his gratitude to the Special Committee for its comprehensive report (A/8828), which clearly demonstrated that Committee's great objectivity in discharging its mission. Its four reports, together with the reports of certain non-governmental organizations and reports published in the world press, had all testified to the maltreatment of civilians in the occupied territories in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

2. In his delegation's view, the root of the problem was that existing international instruments dealing with the protection of the civilian population in armed conflicts were not being fully implemented. Some parties to those conventions, like the Zionist clique, systematically violated them and sought to silence any opposition; while those who dared to criticize the Zionists were immediately branded as anti-semitic. Meanwhile, the other signatory States remained silent.

3. Acting in the name of religion, the so-called Zionist non-governmental organizations, such as the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, the World Jewish Congress and their subsidiary bodies, helped the Zionist clique to achieve its goal. They sought to mislead world public opinion by adducing false arguments in favour of the Zionist practices in the occupied territories. Examples of that policy were the personal attack made by the representative of Israel on the members of the Special Committee and the Israeli Government's attempts to prevent the creation and operation of that body and to discredit its report.

4. In paragraph 86 of its current report, the Special Committee concluded that the policy of the Government of Israel was designed "to effect radical changes in the physical character and demographic composition of several areas of the territories under its occupation by the deliberate eradication of a distinct Palestinian national identity". He drew attention to the measures listed in paragraph 91 of the report, such as the expulsion of persons from the occupied territories, whereby the

Government of Israel had violated international humanitarian law.

5. After its consideration of the question of the violation of human rights in the occupied territories, the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 3 (XXVIII),<sup>1</sup> had expressed its grave concern at all acts and policies that affected the status or the character of those occupied territories and the basic rights of the inhabitants thereof, and had enumerated measures taken by the Government of Israel which constituted grave breaches of the Convention. The Commission had also strongly called upon Israel to rescind forthwith all measures and to desist from all policies and practices affecting the demographic structure or the physical character of the occupied Arab territories and the human rights of their inhabitants.

6. All military occupation was bound to dehumanize the inhabitants under its control. However, the Zionist occupation was unique in its motives and practices, and as a result of Zionist plans for conquest, the world was witnessing the emergence of a new colonial Power in the Middle East.

7. A Zionist writer, Amos Kinan, writing in *Ha'aretz* of 18 May 1972, had admitted that fact when he had stated that the 1 million non-Jewish human beings controlled by Israel provided that State with the cheap labour without which it could not maintain its high standard of living—a situation which constituted the first condition for colonialism. Another condition, the writer had gone on to state, was the fact that the 1 million Arabs constituted a market for Israeli industrial products and in turn, marketed their agricultural products through Israeli-Jewish monopolies.

8. In an article entitled "Battle of the bulldozers" published in *The Manchester Guardian Weekly* of 29 April 1972, a British correspondent, David Hirst, had stated that it was in East Jerusalem that the Israelis were now pressing on most urgently with the fulfilment of their Zionist destiny. He had said that they could do so only by following the classic Zionist method, staking a claim through the accumulation of facts accomplished, and obliterating by sheer physical presence the rival Arab claim, which was based on the abstract legality of immemorial possession of land. He had gone on to state that, by about 1975, the Israelis planned to outnumber the 70,000 Arabs of East Jerusalem with more than 100,000 Jews, many of them immigrants;

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 7, chap. XIII.*

and that the Israelis were now in the process of expelling 5,000 Arabs who lived there and were constructing big new housing estates to accommodate the immigrants. The writer had described the various subterfuges used to persuade unwilling tenants to leave, such as the offer of inadequate compensation, the demolition of adjoining buildings and the use of intimidation.

9. A Canadian writer, Frank H. Epp, in an article entitled "The Palestinians . . . A hijacked people", published in the Canadian edition of the *World Federalist*, No. 98 (November/December 1970), had described the situation in the Gaza Strip as presenting the saddest picture of all: in a little over 100 square miles, there were some 400,000 Palestinians, most of them in UNRWA refugee camps. He had said that it was quite discouraging to see the extent to which Israelis minimized the Palestinians, a people with historic rights to their homeland, with national aspirations and legitimate grievances and rights.

10. The report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/8713 and Corr.1) provided further evidence of Zionist practices in the occupied territories, particularly the Gaza Strip.

11. It was his delegation's firm opinion that the repressive policies and practices of the Zionist clique in the Arab occupied territories were aimed, first, at taking more lands and towns for new Jewish immigrants; second, at frightening the Arab inhabitants and driving them into the desert; and third, at dehumanizing those inhabitants who were determined to stay in spite of untold suffering.

12. The Special Committee should continue to perform its humanitarian task, despite the obstacles created by the Zionist clique to discredit its reports and question its mandate. The international community should take the measures provided for under the Charter of the United Nations in order to punish the Zionist clique for its defiance of world public opinion, its refusal to implement United Nations resolutions and its continued violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The Palestinian freedom-fighters, for their part, were determined to liberate their homeland and achieve their national goal and aspirations.

13. Mr. LARGUI (Tunisia), congratulating the Special Committee on its report (A/8828), said that the wide range of evidence furnished in the report constituted irrefutable proof that Israel was carrying out reprehensible practices affecting the human rights of the Arab population of the occupied territories.

14. The fact that Israel refused to allow the Special Committee access to the territories was in itself a confession of guilt. Furthermore, that fact made the Special Committee's efforts to discharge its task all the more praiseworthy. On 22 November 1972, speaking at the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Secretary-General of the General Union of Tunisian Workers had given an account of the plight of the Palestine refugees and the Palestinians still in

the occupied territories and had requested that a mission of that Confederation should be allowed to visit the territories to study the situation. Since the principle of that request had been accepted, he hoped that new light would thus be shed on Israeli practices in those territories.

15. More than five years after its aggression against neighbouring Arab States, Israel was continuing to exploit the resources of the occupied territories and to "Judaize" the City of Jerusalem in violation of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of international law. Israel continued its policy of expansionism, forcibly deporting the inhabitants of the territories, destroying and expropriating their property and separating members from their own families. Its intentions were obvious—to change the nature of the occupied territories and to destroy the identity of the inhabitants. Such practices constituted the worst form of colonialism.

16. Israel's claim that it was promoting the economic development of the occupied territories and improving the living standards of the Arab population was no legal or moral justification for the occupation, or for denying the inhabitants of those territories their right to freedom and self-determination.

17. His delegation was convinced that law and justice would prevail. Israel could not continue indefinitely to defy the international community. The Arab States whose territories had been occupied were firmly resolved to recover their land. The Palestinian people bore testimony to their unrelenting will to regain their rights.

18. His delegation hoped that the Committee and the General Assembly would adopt a strongly worded resolution in which all peace-loving States would unequivocally condemn the barbarous practices of the Israeli occupation authorities.

19. Mr. TSUKUR (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Special Committee's report was evidence of the important work accomplished by the Special Committee. Despite Israel's intransigence, the Special Committee had gathered evidence that convincingly demonstrated that the Zionists were perpetrating criminal acts in the occupied territories, and that their policy with regard to those territories remained unchanged.

20. That policy, characterized by the inhuman ideology of a superior "chosen people" controlling the destiny of the Arabs of the occupied territory, was based on the colonization of those territories, the expulsion and forcible transfer of the Arabs, the destruction of their homes and expropriation of their lands, and the establishment of paramilitary Jewish settlements.

21. The Israeli aggressors had usurped the Arab land and resources, particularly the oil fields, with the clear aim of exploiting them, and were establishing control over the occupied territories by traditional colonialist means. According to General Shlomo Gazit, chief of the occupation authorities, Israel's

blatant exploitation of those territories was based on the principle of offsetting the costs of occupation against the direct and indirect income from those territories. The Israeli myth of "prosperity" in the occupied territories was very reminiscent of the propagandist ruses employed by the racists of southern Africa to whitewash the sins of colonialism.

22. To the representative of Israel, who had "complained" that the Special Committee in its report merely repeated what had been said before, he wished to point out that the only reason for any repetition was the repeated evidence that the Zionists were continuing to perpetrate their criminal acts in the Arab occupied territories.

23. The policy of *faits accomplis* underlying Israeli practices in the occupied territories represented an ominous chain of annexation, deportation, destruction of homes, blatant racial discrimination and violation of human rights. The number of Arab homes destroyed and families evicted from their lands had diminished; but the desire of the Israeli colonizers to retain control of the Arab occupied territories remained as strong as ever. The statement by Mr. Israel Galili, Israeli Minister without Portfolio, that Israel would leave no vacuum in those territories, and had put no area out of bounds to Jewish settlement, clearly revealed the essence of Israel's policy with regard to the occupied territories. Meanwhile, Israeli representatives tried to justify the destruction of homes, the forcible transfer of the inhabitants and the establishment of Jewish settlements on implausible "security grounds".

24. Yet Mr. Dayan, Israeli Minister of Defence, had stated himself that the establishment of settlements was not very important for the purposes of State security; but that it was extremely important from the point of view of the policy of *faits accomplis*, on the principle that Israel would not give up any place where a settlement had been established.

25. While asserting that the Arab population of the occupied territories were leading prosperous lives, the Israeli representatives studiously avoided the question of the daily violation of human rights of the population; and referred to the occupied territories as "territories under Israeli administration". The Mayor of Jerusalem had been reported as saying unambiguously that Israel would first take the land and that the law would follow afterwards.

26. Most would agree that the basic violation of human rights in the occupied territories was the very fact of occupation. Israel's whole policy in those territories was directed towards annexing those lands as the "prize" for its piratical aggression against Arab States.

27. Only the unconditional implementation of United Nations resolutions, particularly all parts of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), by withdrawing troops from all the occupied territories, would put an end to the violation of human rights in those territories and pave the way to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

28. His delegation fully supported the work of the Special Committee, which should be continued so long as the Israeli occupation lasted.

29. Mr. TALEB-BENDIAB (Algeria) said that when, at the end of the Second World War, right had finally triumphed over racism, the Palestinian people had, like other people throughout the world, placed their hopes in the wisdom of the international community to help them achieve a national sovereignty in which all the communities established for so many centuries in that region would be able to preserve the heritage of the civilizations of Moses, Jesus and Mohammed. However, Europe's feeling of guilt towards a Jewish community which had been persecuted in Europe by Europeans had led it, in the name of an international organization in which the third world had no say, to plant in Palestine an incongruous medley of foreigners, thus doing a gross injustice to a people which had had no hand in the sufferings inflicted on that European Jewish community, depriving a whole people of its homeland and property and reviving, in Zionism, the methods of aggression of the Nazism which it had condemned and conquered.

30. The evils of the Israeli policy, characterized by systematic destruction, mass deportation, annexation and torture were described objectively in the report of the Special Committee, the courage, integrity and impartiality of whose members was unquestionable. Their report reflected the desire of the international community to understand the scope and nature of the Israeli policy of occupation and annexation. It was not surprising that Israel should as usual question the legality of the procedure by which the Committee had been set up and the impartiality of its members and continue to refuse any co-operation with it, thus adopting an attitude to truth and justice similar to that of the authorities of Pretoria.

31. The facts were there. Transfer of populations, expropriation, demolition, colonial settlement, deportation and torture were all flagrant violations of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. Their existence had been corroborated by various reliable sources and in official statements by Zionist authorities. The report stated that the final result of such a policy would be the total disappearance of any Palestinian presence in the region. His delegation could not fail to condemn the realization of Israel's expansionist dream, based on racism, superiority and denial of the rights of others.

32. The Zionist representative's praise of aggression and of the benefits of colonization was based on the logic of all oppressors. In effect, he was saying that guns and even napalm were signs of prosperity for the Palestinians. Such statements no longer deceived anyone.

33. Algeria could not help protesting against the inhuman methods used by an international terrorist group, which was what the Zionists were, against the Palestinian people and the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories. It appealed once more to the international community to condemn those barbarous

acts in order to protect humanitarian values and human rights. Like all peoples who loved justice and liberty, the Palestinians wished to recover their lands and would fight for them in accordance with the principles of the Charter. When it had recognized the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to a national existence and condemned the annexation of territories by force, the international community had proved its regard for justice and its realization of the danger Zionism represented for international peace and security. There would be no true and lasting peace in that region until the land was given back to its rightful owners and the rights of the Palestinian people had been finally restored. If it managed to end all those arbitrary acts of violence, the international community would have fulfilled its mission.

34. Mr. KARZY (Afghanistan) said that his delegation strongly believed that it was the duty of every Member State to honour its responsibilities under the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Any violation of those principles was a matter of grave concern for the Organization and called for appropriate action. Since its establishment, no doubt because the General Assembly had felt that a Member State in the Middle East had violated those principles, the Special Committee had spared no effort to bring its practices to the attention of the United Nations, despite Israel's refusal to allow them to carry out their humanitarian mission.

35. On the basis of the unchallengeable evidence submitted in the report of the Special Committee (A/8828), it was clear that the Israeli Government was pursuing a systematic pattern of armed aggression, terror, occupation and colonization. The destruction of Arab towns and villages, the denial of the right to return, the changing of the Arab character of the occupied territories, the expulsion of their inhabitants, the imposition of collective punishment, the confiscation of Arab property and the replacement of the Arab inhabitants by alien settlers were all clear examples of a policy designed to annex the occupied territories and constituted a flagrant violation of the principles of international law, human rights and the Charter.

36. In pursuing such policies, Israel had violated its obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention,<sup>2</sup> especially articles 32, 33, 47, 53 and 54 thereof. Since the fundamental violation of human rights lay in the very fact of occupation, the most effective way of safeguarding those rights was to end the occupation.

37. The report of the Special Committee had confirmed that such violations of human rights had become even more manifest during 1972. That situation should not be allowed to continue indefinitely, if the United Nations, which bore the prime responsibility for the situation as the creator of the State of Israel, which it had admitted into the Organization on the condition that it assumed certain commitments which it had never respected, meant to ensure conditions for a stable and lasting peace in the Middle East. Nothing could be more damaging to the United Nations than a failure

to enforce its own decisions. It must therefore take more effective measures in accordance with the Charter to put an end to the forceful occupation of territories of three Member States and restore the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

38. Mrs. NIGAM (India) said that the report of the Special Committee and its Chairman's statement at the 849th meeting, revealed a deplorable situation. In his letter of transmittal to the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Special Committee had said that the measures taken by Israel in the occupied territories tended to show that it would make them socially, economically, politically and juridically part of Israel unless some form of supervision was put into effect immediately to arrest such a trend (see A/8828). The Israeli representative's assertion at the same meeting that occupation was beneficial to the enslaved people of the occupied territories showed his country's intention to perpetuate that occupation. Her delegation rejected that argument. It had consistently held the view that Israeli occupation of Arab territories since 1967 was a flagrant violation of human rights and that the refugee problem and the human rights of the population of the occupied territories were inseparable from the basic question of the illegal occupation of those territories by the Israeli Government.

39. While the Israeli representative wished the Committee to believe that the report submitted by the Special Committee was biased, he insisted that it should accept his statement on the benefits of occupation as objective. If the report was biased, the responsibility lay in part with the Israeli Government's lack of co-operation, which was surprising if the situation in those territories was really as satisfactory as he maintained.

40. The statement of the Israeli representative had done nothing to allay the fears of the Indian and many other delegations that attempts were being made to change the facts in the occupied territories. The right course would have been to refute the evidence quoted by the Special Committee in its second report and its addendum (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and 2) concerning the Israeli Government's policy to change the physical character and demographic composition of the occupied territories and eliminate Palestinian presence in those areas rather than challenge the integrity of the Special Committee.

41. Her Government continued to reject all Israeli excuses for not withdrawing from the Arab territories occupied since 1967 despite numerous United Nations resolutions.

42. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the situation in the Middle East and particularly in the Arab territories occupied by Israel gave rise to deep alarm and concern throughout the world community. Committing the international crime of aggression in June 1967, Israel had illegally seized and forcibly retained considerable Arab territories in defiance of United Nations decisions; it sabotaged peaceful efforts and initiatives taken by the United Nations and openly pursued a policy of appropriating

<sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

and Israelizing Arab lands. Israel's annexationist policy with regard to the occupied territories went hand in hand with arbitrary rule and outrages by the Israeli occupation authorities with regard to the local Arab population. In view of those facts it was entirely just that the question of Israeli violations of human rights in the occupied Arab territories should be considered at the current session as a serious and important aspect of the situation in the Middle East.

43. In its report the Special Committee had not been able to list all the countless crimes committed by the Zionist occupiers in the temporarily usurped Arab lands. The Special Committee had been artificially restricted in its work by Israel's continued refusal, in defiance of the exhortation made by the General Assembly in resolution 2851 (XXVI), to allow it to enter the occupied territories. Nevertheless, the Special Committee had done a great deal of responsible work in analysing facts and information relating to certain important violations by Israel of international conventions and principles of international law.

44. At the previous session his delegation had already supported (802nd meeting) the conclusions of the Special Committee, in particular, its conclusion that the fundamental violation of human rights in the occupied territories lay in the very fact of the illegal occupation of those territories. Facts known throughout the world showed that Israel, supported by international imperialism and Zionism, stubbornly disregarded the decisions of the United Nations concerning a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, refused to withdraw its forces from the Arab lands occupied in 1967, made absurd annexationist claims to those territories, took practical steps to establish itself in them as permanently as possible and forcibly expelled the Arabs from those territories for the obvious purpose of perpetuating the armed conflict in the Middle East and continuing its policy of aggression and expansionism. The Israeli occupation authorities were using mass terror, persecution and other criminal acts against the Arab population, destroying homes and refugee camps and obliterating Arab historic and cultural objects in order to change the demographic character of the usurped Arab lands, "Israelize" them and allow the natural resources to be plundered by Israeli and international Zionist companies.

45. The Special Committee's report convincingly showed that the policy of the Israeli Government was to bring about radical changes in the physical nature and demographic composition of certain areas of the territories, through the premeditated elimination of the national characteristics of the Palestinians. The Special Committee quite rightly confirmed in its report (see A/8828, para. 87) that Israel's deliberate policy of annexing and settling the occupied territories was at variance with the human rights of the inhabitants of the territories. His delegation firmly supported that conclusion by the Special Committee. In that connexion, his delegation felt it necessary to stress that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 3 (XXVIII), had considered that Israel's breaches of the

fourth Geneva Convention constituted war crimes and an affront to humanity.

46. History showed that States waging wars of aggression inevitably violated universally accepted laws and conventions of warfare since they prevented the aggressor from attaining the predatory purposes of such wars. That was precisely how Hitler's Fascists had acted during the Second World War, how aggressors had acted since then and how the Zionist aggressors were acting now, in their pursuit of territorial expansion in the Middle East. The Israeli authorities' malicious violations of international humanitarian conventions in the usurped territories were far from being caused only by excesses on the part of individuals in the Israeli administration. They were the consequence of the planned implementation of a criminal annexationist policy by the Israeli Government and of the extravagant goals of international Zionism, which were based on the racist notion of a "chosen people", allegedly called upon to dominate the neighbouring Arab peoples. Such wild racist ideas were not new. Everyone knew what had happened 26 years previously to the proponents of similar racist ideas, who had claimed to be above international law.

47. The war crimes of the Israeli aggressor against the population of the occupied territories were of a State-organized nature and were planned as part and parcel of international Zionism's policy of seizing ever more *Lebensraum* in the Middle East for Israel. The aggressors knew that, to achieve the goals of their predatory war, it was not enough to occupy the territory of neighbouring Arab countries, since they understood that such wars met with resolute resistance by the people. Their crime of aggression was therefore inevitably supplemented by crimes committed on a massive scale by the usurper in the temporarily occupied territories against the population of the territories.

48. Israel's actions in the occupied Arab lands were a clear example of that. The report of the Special Committee noted the deportation by the Israeli authorities of the Arab population, the destruction of homes, the establishment of Israeli settlements, the expropriation of Arab property and the denial of the right of return to civilians who had left the territories during the military operations in 1967 and afterwards. All those and many other violations by Israel of the fourth Geneva Convention should be categorically condemned by the General Assembly. Effective measures should be taken against the aggressor to force him to cease his plunderous activities against the neighbouring Arab countries and peoples and to withdraw his troops from all the occupied Arab territories.

49. His delegation supported those delegations which considered that, so long as Israel refused to implement United Nations decisions and continued to occupy Arab lands, the efforts to unmask the crimes of the Israeli occupation authorities must be pursued. His country's support for United Nations decisions on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied territories and on the political settlement of the conflict



was a policy of principle which it would unswervingly continue to pursue.

50. In order to counteract the imperialist arbitrary rule of the Israeli militarists in the Middle East, eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression of June 1967, prevent further aggressive acts by Israel against the Arab countries and establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, the Soviet Union was extending effective and friendly political and economic assistance to the Arab countries and also helping them to strengthen their defensive potential. His country also supported the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine to restore its inalienable rights, which had been recognized by the United Nations.

51. The Soviet people were firmly convinced that Israel's criminal activities in the temporarily occupied Arab territories to consolidate its position there and persecute the Arab population were doomed to failure. The just rights of the Arab peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine, would inevitably triumph. Only on that basis could a just and lasting peace be established in the Middle East, as shown by United Nations decisions.

52. Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal) expressed his delegation's full approval of the report of the Special Committee, which it had read with feelings of regret, for it was convinced that the rights of the Arab inhabitants would continue to be violated as long as Israel occupied the territories. Since the Israeli authorities knew that that occupation was a violation of human rights, it was not surprising that they had refused to co-operate with the Special Committee. In view of that attitude and the long list of arbitrary measures adopted against the inhabitants of the occupied territories, it was impossible not to be pessimistic about their future. Despite the prudent wording of the conclusions of the Special Committee (see A/8828, paras. 83, 84 and 86-90), the measures adopted by Israel in the occupied territories clearly violated the rights of the Arab population, which the Security Council in its resolution 237 (1967) had called "essential and inalienable" and which were also protected by the third and fourth Geneva Conventions, both ratified by the Israeli Government. Inspired by humanitarianism and respect for right and justice, his Government unequivocally condemned Israel's unco-operative attitude and its annexation of the occupied territories. If it allowed the Special Committee to carry out its investigation in those territories, Israel would at least give some hope that they might be liberated peacefully. The solution of the problem lay in the full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

53. Mr. CHUANG (China) said that the report of the Special Committee and the statements by its Chairman and by the representatives of many Arab countries had exposed the Israeli Zionists' barbarous persecution of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories, in open violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, as well as their ambitious design to perpetuate their occupation of Arab territories by changing their

character. His delegation firmly supported the just stand of the Arab representatives and appreciated the efforts made by the Special Committee.

54. The Israeli representative's slander of the Arab countries and peoples and his shameless boasting about the prosperity and happiness in the Israeli-occupied territories were reminiscent of the arguments of the old colonialists. Nothing was more precious to a nation than independence. The Palestinian people's heroic resistance in Gaza was a resounding answer to those boasts.

55. The crimes committed in the occupied territories represented only one side of the Israeli aggressor's crimes against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. The crucial reason why the Middle East question had remained unsolved lay in the super-Powers' perpetuation of a situation of "no war, no peace" in that region, which enabled them to compete for spheres of influence. That policy of the super-Powers inflated the arrogance of the Israeli aggressors and aggravated the sufferings of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. Experience had taught those peoples that only by strengthening their unity, relying on their own strength, breaking through the super-Powers' obstruction and sabotage and waging unrelenting struggles against the Israeli aggressors would they recover their lost territories and restore their national rights.

56. The Chinese Government and people had always shown deep sympathy for the Arab people in the Israeli-occupied territories and firmly supported the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just fight against Israeli aggression. That fight would be long and difficult but, if the Palestinian and other peoples persevered in unity, victory would finally be theirs.

57. Mr. BEAVOGUI (Guinea) said that, after studying the report of the Special Committee and hearing the Chairman of that Committee on the one hand and the arguments advanced by the Israeli representative on the other, all the Committee now needed was to draw the obvious conclusions. His delegation fully approved the contents of the report of the Special Committee, which would continue to have his delegation's confidence. Israel's allegations had made the true policy of Zionism sufficiently clear. The statement by the representative of Israel had given the lie to arguments that Israel was waging a defensive war in the Middle East only in order to ensure its survival, since the whole statement had been an attempt to give a glowing picture of colonialism. Neither South Africa, Portugal nor any other colonialist Power could have done better. Israel's arguments were no more than an insult to the intelligence of the United Nations in general and the Committee in particular.

58. He wondered if the Israeli representative was forgetting that the majority of Members of the United Nations had formerly been colonized and had often heard that type of argument in favour of the alleged benefits of colonization. His country for one saw no advantages in foreign domination. That was why his

people had opted for independence on 28 September 1958, preferring freedom in poverty to opulence in slavery.

59. His Government had realized the expansionist designs of Israel from the very outbreak of hostilities, despite the deceitful propaganda carried out on Israel's behalf. It had therefore not hesitated to break off relations with that country. The substance of the problem was not so much that of knowing whether or not Israel was implementing the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention but that of seeing to it that Israel withdrew without delay from the occupied territories, in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Israel must implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

60. Israel's policy of colonization presented the international community with a *fait accompli* and constituted a constant threat to international peace and security. All Member States should act together to put an end to the colonization of the occupied Arab territories.

61. His country requested to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.258.

62. Mr. MATYUKHIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation approved the work done by the Special Committee, which, despite Israel's refusal to co-operate, had been able to gather a great deal of factual material that unmasked the crimes of the Israeli aggressors in the occupied Israeli territories. Israel's refusal to allow the members of the Special Committee to enter the occupied territories was a fundamental obstacle to the Special Committee in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly and had forced it to have recourse to other means of establishing the facts prevailing in the occupied territories. That refusal showed the hypocrisy of the statement made by the Israeli representative in the Committee, in which he had tried to refute the facts referred to by the Special Committee.

63. The report of the Special Committee convincingly showed that, despite numerous decisions of the General Assembly and appeals to Israel to put an end to the practice of violating human rights in the occupied territories, Israel was continuing and even escalating its criminal actions against the Arab population. The Israeli aggressors destroyed the homes, villages and property of the Arabs and expelled them from their homelands, in gross violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. In that connexion, he drew attention to the prohibition made in article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention.

64. In the lands from which the Arab population had been expelled the Israeli aggressors were establishing military settlements. Since the military operations of June 1967 Israel had established at least 43 settlements in the occupied territories. The Zionist policy of establishing settlements of the colonial type was predicated above all on military considerations and plans to

incorporate the settled territories in Israel. Israel was continuing to try to effect a radical change in the physical character and demographic composition of the usurped lands in order to make them socially, economically, politically and legally a part of Israel. Israel might persevere in such crimes. Not all of them were noted even in the report of the Special Committee, for Israel had not allowed the members of the Committee to enter the occupied territories to investigate instances of violations of human rights objectively.

65. Israel's stubbornness in opposing all attempts at reaching a just political settlement of the Middle East crisis hindered the implementation of the mission of Mr. Gunnar Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Middle East. It was able to pursue that policy only thanks to the support of international Zionist and imperialist circles, which had thrown open the doors of their arsenals to the Israeli militarists.

66. Zionism had much in common with fascism and *apartheid*, the main similarity being that they all led to crimes against humanity. For their crimes the Fascists had been severely punished by all mankind, and the proponents of *apartheid* in South Africa bore responsibility for their crimes before mankind and the national liberation movements. For similar crimes against mankind Israel and its leaders had to bear responsibility before the United Nations and the entire world. The rulers of Israel would finally have to understand that they would never be forgiven for the crimes they had committed against the Arab peoples. They could not indefinitely escape punishment for the aggression they had committed in the Middle East. The quickest possible attainment of a political settlement in the Middle East and the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression would be in the interests of the Israeli people. The Middle East problem, like the problems of ensuring the legitimate rights of the population of the occupied territories and all the peoples of the Middle East, including the Palestinians, could be solved only through the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the occupied territories, the return of the territories to the Arabs and the full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and other decisions concerning the Middle East. That was the only way just and lasting peace could be achieved in the area. States Members of the United Nations should take immediate steps, availing themselves of all the potentialities of the Charter, to compel Israel to put an end to the piracy in the Middle East.

67. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that for the past week the Committee had been hearing a large number of statements that followed the usual pattern of anti-Israeli propaganda, whose spokesmen used any and every means to vilify his country. It did not seem to matter that such statements had very little relevance to the item on the agenda, the report of the Special Committee. As his delegation had already stated (849th meeting), the very appointment of the Special Committee had been of dubious legality, its mandate had prejudged the ques-

tions it was supposed to investigate and its composition had been such as to make it completely unacceptable. In ordinary life no judge who had a predetermined opinion on a matter would be considered qualified to carry out an investigation. Such was not, however, the case in the very special world of the United Nations. For three years now the Special Committee had tried desperately to implicate Israel in discreditable practices in the administered areas. However, any objective observer could see that Israel's record in those areas was nothing to be ashamed of. The problems of the areas would find their solution in the context of a peace settlement. Despite that, draft resolution A/SPC/L.258 went far beyond even the findings of the Special Committee and brought in matters that not only had no connexion with reality but were not even supported by the Special Committee. For example, operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution had obviously been introduced for extraneous political reasons, and operative paragraph 5 even introduced an element of coercion completely outside the scope of the present matter.

68. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that, since the Israeli representative was commenting on a draft resolution which had not yet been introduced, he should be ruled out of order.

69. Mr. DORON (Israel) pointed out that the draft resolution had already been circulated and that other delegations had referred to it and indicated whether or not they supported it.

70. The CHAIRMAN agreed that the draft resolution had been referred to by other speakers but requested the Israeli representative to comment on it at a later stage since it was not yet officially open for debate.

71. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to a statement made at the current meeting by a representative who had spoken of collusion between the two super-Powers to maintain tension in the Middle East. The Soviet delegation had already emphasized that that representative's country would do well to assist the Arab peoples as much as the Soviet Union did. Instead of giving real assistance to the Arab peoples in the struggle against imperialist aggression, the country in question engaged in idle slander against the Soviet Union and hindered political efforts undertaken in the United Nations to safeguard the just principles of a settlement in the Middle East, which the Arab people desired. In resorting to anti-Soviet slander, that speaker was merely trying to conceal the fact that his country was not giving real assistance to the Arab peoples. Who stood to benefit from such a situation? Only Israel.

72. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wanted to refer to certain important issues that affected the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East and that the Israeli representative had evaded. He was referring to the illegal establishment of settlements in the occupied territories and the forcible transfer and deportation of the population of the occupied territories. Those were extremely serious matters and the fact that the Israeli representative had not commented on them should be emphasized. He challenged the Israeli representative to speak about them and not merely dwell on the supposed happiness of the people in the occupied territories. The establishment of those settlements was a serious challenge to the Geneva Conventions, United Nations decisions and the establishment of peace in the Middle East.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*