

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING
held on Monday, 6 May 1968, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. BONI (Ivory Coast)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Boni (Ivory Coast), Vice-Chairman, took the chair.

RESPECT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (agenda item 12) (A/CONF.32/22, A/CONF.32/27, A/CONF.32/29, A/CONF.32/L.19 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/L.20)

Mr. LOPEZ SCHUMMER (Spain) introduced draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19 and Corr.1. His delegation considered that the draft resolution could contribute to the implementation of human rights in occupied territories in which suffering and poverty prevailed. By way of example, he mentioned the plight of minorities in the territories occupied during the 1939-1945 war. Representatives who had heard his statement at the plenary meeting were aware of his Government's concern about the Middle East refugees. In the name of human rights, Spain had called for more attention, more respect; more humanity, more justice and more love for the Palestine refugees. It was the responsibility of all representatives without exception to put an end to that grievous situation, which might well provoke movements of anger and vengeance.

The Conference should not consider the draft resolution as an attack against anyone; its sponsors were submitting it to the Conference in a spirit of humanity.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that from the beginning his delegation had urged that the Conference should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict, for a debate on that subject would only waste its time and energy and lower its prestige. Almost two weeks previously, his delegation had declared that it would as far as possible refrain from replying to anti-Israel propaganda; yet such attacks had continued since.

His delegation, like others, had deplored the inscription of the item on the agenda and had hoped that it would at least be dealt with in general terms. The Conference was not in a position to form objective opinions, as was evident from the Note by the Secretary-General to the Government of Israel (A/CONF.32/29), from which he read lengthy extracts. The Note indicated that Mr. Gussing's report, written in July 1967, a few weeks after the hostilities, was no longer up to date, that there was no recent report on the current situation of the civilian population and that it would be useful in many respects once again to send a representative to that region.

The Israel Government had accepted that proposal: Israel had nothing to conceal and was prepared to submit its record to international scrutiny. The question was whether the Conference was in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter and draw conclusions; he thought that the Conference should reject outright any proposal on the substance of the matter, such as the draft resolution submitted by the Spanish delegation (A/CONF.32/L.19).

The Israel delegation was conscious that the strife-torn region was trying to grope its way towards peace, the best guarantee of human rights. Verbal warfare in Teheran did nothing to promote the cause of peace. In that connexion, he referred to the statement by the representative of Madagascar at the seventeenth meeting on Thursday 2 May, whose plea for tolerance, mutual respect and co-operation between Israel and the Arab States had been made in a spirit of goodwill which had moved the Israel delegation. There had been no such reaction from the Arab delegations, since the debate had started with an attack by the representative of the United Arab Republic and an anti-Israel draft resolution had already been submitted.

His delegation therefore had no option but to make a full statement of the facts, while continuing to maintain that the matter was beyond the competence of the Conference.

His statement would be in three parts: the circumstances in which Israel forces occupied the territories in question, the past and present conditions of the civilian population in those territories, and the situation of Jewish minorities in certain Arab countries in the area of conflict.

The Arab invasion of 1948 had been intended to destroy the infant State of Israel by force of arms. Although repulsed, the Arab armies had retained military occupation of certain areas of the country. As a result, Egypt had remained in possession of the Gaza Strip and Jordan of the West Bank area, which it had later annexed. Despite the United Nations peace-keeping efforts, the Arab States had refused to accept the State of Israel, a policy that had led to three Israel-Arab wars in nineteen years, the last being the Six-Day War.

The spokesmen of Arab and certain other countries had repeatedly asserted that the Israel-held territories had been occupied by aggression and that the United Nations had called upon Israel to withdraw from them unconditionally. The United Nations itself had firmly rejected those Arab-Soviet assertions. The majority of Member States had refused to give credence to that version of the facts. That was not surprising; the dramatic events of May and June 1967 were still too fresh in the public mind for history to be re-written.

In the weeks preceding 5 June 1967 there had been great military preparations, the massing of Egyptian troops at the southern border of Israel, Egypt's demand for the instant removal of the United Nations force and the proclamation of the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the warlike statements of President Abd el Nasser.

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that the object of the meeting was to consider an item on the agenda. Political matters were not relevant and could be discussed outside the meeting, particularly since the Conference had little time left for its work.

The Israel representative was not consistent with himself, for the matters of which he spoke were not relevant. If the Israel representative was entitled to make such a statement before the Conference, all the Arab States should likewise give their version of the situation; in that case, he reserved the right to revert to the subject later.

Mr. COMAY (Israel), resuming his statement, pointed out that Arab representatives had wanted the Conference to examine the question in detail, constantly alleging that Israel had occupied those territories by aggression and that the United Nations had called upon Israel to withdraw. He felt it important to place the question in its correct historic context.

Mr. EL-SAYYAD (United Arab Republic), intervening on a point of order, said that the Conference had met to examine questions of human rights and not to waste time talking about past history.

Mr. COMAY (Israel), resuming his statement, described the mood before the hostilities, the signature of the United Arab Republic's pact with Jordan and the advance of Iraqi forces and referred, by way of illustration, to the collection of political cartoons published at that time in the highly imaginative Arab press which still continued in the same vein painting its picture of life in the Israel-administered territories.

Israel at the time had been in deadly peril and had had to fight for its survival. He retraced the week of hostilities and the destruction of the Arab armies. He pointed out that there was an intimate relationship between peace and human rights, and invited the war-mongers to reflect on the suffering which wars involved.

The Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, adopted unanimously, called for a lasting peace in the Middle East, including recognized and secure frontiers between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. Israel wanted peace and was willing to exchange the existing cease-fire lines for recognized frontiers, as part of a general peace settlement. Meanwhile, Israel would continue to administer the area on its side of the cease-fire line.

Turning to the events that followed the war, he said that, suddenly finding itself having to administer territories containing a million Arabs, Israel had had to improvise to restore normal life. He described his country's efforts to organize the area, stressing the co-operation of Arab local authorities most of whom had remained in office. He also described the restoration of public services and supplies and the revival of economic activity which had improved slightly since 1967. Those efforts had naturally constituted a financial burden for Israel; he quoted a number of figures from the budgetary allocations for civilian services.

He gave further particulars of the situation in the Gaza Strip, which had been occupied by the Egyptians since 1948. The economic and political situation had not improved in nineteen years; indeed, it had steadily deteriorated until Israel had taken control of the territory.

A great deal of money and effort had been spent on reviving and stimulating economic activity and creating employment in the area, much had been done in the field of health, education, vocational training, and complete freedom of movement had been accorded to residents of the area.

The West Bank had been occupied by Jordanian forces in 1948 in defiance of United Nations decisions on Palestine. For nineteen years it had remained occupied territory, without Jordanian absorption of it being recognized by the outside world, even by other Arab States. Indeed, life in the area was far more peaceful under Israel's authority than it had been before June 1967. In support of that statement, he listed the incidents (arrests, demonstrations, closure of schools, imprisonments, curfews, strikes, military action against civilians) that had occurred in the eighteen months preceding the Six-Day War. Relations between the Israel authorities and the local population were calm by comparison, as could be confirmed by the hundreds of thousands of people, Israeli residents and others, who travelled around the area in complete freedom and even declared having seldom seen army units or military vehicles.

Economically, the West Bank of the Jordan had always been at a disadvantage compared with the East Bank, as far as both investment and development were concerned. Israel had made a major effort to revive and develop economic life on the West Bank. After less than a year, agriculture, which supported half the population, was beginning to receive a new impetus. Production councils had been set

up for specific products. New crops and scientific crop-planning had been introduced. Arabic-speaking Israeli instructors were training local farmers in modern cultivation techniques; the farmers were able to visit and learn from the Arab villages in Israel where farm output had increased sixfold in two decades.

Before the June 1967 war, farm produce on the West Bank had been exported to the East Bank and to Arab countries. With the encouragement of the Israeli authorities that flow had been resumed, and over a hundred trucks crossed the Jordan River eastwards every day over Bailey bridges constructed specifically for that purpose jointly by the Israeli and Jordan army engineers.

Moreover, thousands of people (30,000 according to the Financial Times) had already crossed the Jordan on temporary permits issued by the Israeli authorities for periods of one to two weeks. It was the first time such movements were taking place to and fro between Israel and Arab territories. Furthermore, West Bank residents, Gaza residents and Israelis were travelling freely to all parts of the area held by Israel. That freedom of movement enabled people to see things as they really were and to judge for themselves, and was having a revolutionary effect on their feelings and attitudes. The Arabs in territories under Israeli control wanted to live in peace and coexistence with Israel. That was what the Arab Governments did not like and what drove them to such frantic efforts to persuade the world that Israel committed atrocities and violated human rights.

To achieve their ends they promoted armed raids; terrorists crossed the cease-fire line, and their activity was dressed up as a resistance movement by the local population against Israel occupiers. No such resistance movement existed in Israel-held territories. Similar terrorist activity had occurred in the past whenever the Arab countries had shrunk from a direct confrontation with Israel. He recalled the murderous fedayeen raids organized by Egypt from the Gaza Strip between 1953 and 1956; it was those attacks that had led to the Sinai campaign and the occupation of the Gaza Strip by Israel. After a respite of some ten years, while Egypt had been building up its strength for a new confrontation with Israel, the Syrian regime had launched similar attacks under the name of the Palestinian "People's War". Terrorist squads trained and equipped by Syria had been sent into Israel from Jordan and the Lebanon, and Israel's occasional reaction to them had been the theme of numerous Security Council debates.

That type of activity came under every definition of aggression ever suggested in the United Nations. In support of that statement, he quoted the definition of "Aggressor" submitted some years earlier by the Soviet Union in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly (draft resolution A/C.6/L.208, para. 1(e) and (f) and para. 2). According to that definition, raids of that type were violations of the cease-fire, and Israel had to take all necessary measures to repel and restrict them in accordance with its duty under the United Nations resolutions which held it responsible for the safety of territories in its control.

It was also worth mentioning that the areas where the raids were most frequent, such as the Beisan Valley and the Negev, had always been part of the State of Israel and were not the areas occupied by Israel in June 1967. The El Fatah and Fedayin terrorists were all cowardly murderers. There was no comparison between their methods and aims and the resistance movements as known in occupied Europe. That view was confirmed in a resolution adopted by the International Union of Resistance Movements and Deportation Victims at its conference held at Brussels from 31 March to 2 April 1968, from which he quoted an extract.

So far as religious rights were concerned, he said that the decision by which the kneset had, on 27 June 1967, guaranteed the protection of all holy places and complete freedom of access to those places for the members of all religions should be compared with the situation in the past: massacres and deportation of the Jews in Jordan in 1948, the destruction of synagogues, the desecration of the cemetery on the Mount of Olives, prohibition of access to the Wall of Jerusalem by Jews and refusal of permission for Arabs in Israel to make pilgrimages to Mecca.

With respect to refugees, the Government of Israel had asked the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) to continue its work as soon as the fighting had ceased; on 14 June 1967, it had signed an agreement of co-operation with UNRWA, which had been provided with all possible facilities in the areas under Israel's authority.

In that connexion, the Government of Israel had without delay taken up with the Agency the question of the inflammatory propaganda in school textbooks. All propaganda of that type had been deleted from the books used in the West Bank and Gaza Strip areas, and the Israel authorities had asked the Agency to take similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA had referred the problem to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), with which it co-operated in running the refugee schools. In November 1967, UNESCO had adopted a resolution declaring that

any incitement to hatred was contrary to the principles of the UNESCO Constitution and the Universal Declaration, and had requested the Director-General of UNESCO to initiate contacts with the States concerned with a view to implementing the resolution. To the best of the Israel delegation's knowledge, no similar action had yet been taken in an Arab country. If Israel and the Arabs were one day to be able to live in a spirit of mutual tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation would have to begin with the children in the schools.

Apart from the exodus mentioned by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA which had taken place at the time of the conflict in June 1967, a voluntary flow had been moving from the West Bank towards the East Bank and beyond. That flow was, incidentally, traditional. In recent months, it had slowed to a trickle, but there was a small-scale movement from Gaza. In any event, Israel did not hold anyone back against his will.

The United Nations resolutions called for the repatriation of refugees; the Israel Government had agreed to facilitate that repatriation, subject to the requirements of security. In 1967, it had proposed a repatriation scheme with the co-operation of the International Red Cross. Permission to return had been granted to 21,000 persons, but only 14,000 had actually returned. Israel's efforts to bring back the remaining 7,000 had been unsuccessful through the fault of the Jordanian authorities, who had not attended the meeting arranged by the Red Cross to discuss the matter. Jordan had, moreover, made the situation even more difficult by inciting the returnees to undermine and to obstruct the Israel administration. Another repatriation scheme, also elaborated with the co-operation of the Red Cross, had had to be interrupted when two Red Cross representatives had been wounded by Jordanian fire at the Allenby Bridge. The Israel Government was continuing its action alone. The inhabitants of the West Bank could apply for the return of their relatives. The approved names were broadcast and, on the appointed day, those concerned came to the Allenby Bridge and were allowed to cross.

The Israel Government was sensitive to the humanitarian problems of refugees, whose lot it would endeavour to improve in so far as conditions permitted. It was obvious that, if the conflict was to be settled peacefully, priority would have to be given to humanitarian questions. In that connexion, he mentioned an article entitled "The Israelis as Occupiers" which had appeared in the Daily Telegraph on 30 April, from which he read extracts. The representatives who had recently been in Israel could corroborate the facts mentioned in that article. The other representatives, including those of the Arab countries, were welcome to come and verify them for themselves.

Combating terrorism certainly involved security problems, and it would be going too far to say that all the Arabs were satisfied or even that they wished to remain indefinitely under Israel authority. However, oppression and ill-treatment were self-defeating. It was in Israel's own interest to show that Jews and Arabs could live in friendship in the region they shared. The current co-existence of two and a half million Jews and one and a half million Arabs in the territories administered by Israel was a hopeful augury for the future. It was erroneous to say, as did draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19, that Israel was violating human rights.

It had been pointed out that the United Nations resolutions concerned the fate of all civilians living throughout the area of conflict, including the Arab countries. The Israel delegation accused the Governments of Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Iraq of flagrant violations of the human rights of the Jewish civilians living in their territories. In 1948, Jordanian forces had destroyed the Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, which they had then just occupied. All the Jewish villages in the occupied area had been destroyed and their inhabitants massacred or deported. There had been no Jews at all in Jordan since 1948.

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, asked the President to request the representative of Israel to confine himself to the item on the agenda: the respect and implementation of human rights in occupied territories.

The PRESIDENT invited the representative of Israel to continue his statement.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that he had taken the floor to comment on draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19, which recalled Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967; the contents of those resolutions justified his speaking of the Jewish populations living in Arab territories.

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19 dealt solely with the areas of military operations since the outbreak of hostilities.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) asked for clarification of the meaning of "areas of military operations".

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) again asked the President to invite the representative of Israel to keep to the subject.

The PRESIDENT asked the representative of Israel to confine his remarks to the situation of refugees in occupied territories.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19 was clearly slanted; for example, the fourth preambular paragraph paraphrased United Nations resolutions in such a way as to hide the fact that they applied to all the States in the area of conflict and to give the impression that they were addressed only to Israel.

The fifth preambular paragraph slipped in the question of the status of Jerusalem, which was completely unrelated to the Conference and had not even been discussed.

The last preambular paragraph mentioned a telegram from the Commission on Human Rights without stating that the Commission had been relying on press articles rather than on verified facts. In those circumstances, it was unfortunate that the Commission should have taken the liberty of asking the Government of a Member State to "desist forthwith" from security measures of which it had knowledge only from the press.

Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 contained sweeping generalizations. They affirmed that human rights were being violated in the Arab territories and informed the Government of Israel of the grave consequences resulting from its alleged disregard of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Conference was being asked to pronounce a judgment which was supported neither by the documents cited in the preamble nor by any objective inquiry. In point of fact, the Secretary-General, when faced with the allegations concerning the treatment of civilians in the area in question, had clearly indicated that he lacked the necessary facts for making a report and would send someone to the area to carry out an inquiry.

The Israel delegation rejected the operative paragraphs, and it was convinced that all fair-minded delegations would vote against the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.20, on the contrary, confined itself to noting the measures taken by the Secretary-General without seeking to draw hasty and unwarranted conclusions. The contrast clearly revealed the slanted nature of draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19.

Mr. AWAD MOHAMMED (United Arab Republic) referred to documents A/CONF.32/22, A/CONF.32/27 and A/CONF.32/29, which the Secretariat had drawn up to serve as a basis for discussion of the item under study. The representative of Israel had mentioned the appointment by the Secretary-General of a mission of inquiry. There was at present the report of Mr. Gussing, in which he made it clear that, during his visit to refugees in the occupied Arab territories, he had been constantly accompanied by Israelis and that he had never been able to listen to the refugees without his escort which had made it impossible for those concerned to testify freely.

Moreover, to be logical with himself the representative of Israel should have refrained from giving his version of the situation and awaited the conclusions of the Secretary-General's mission of inquiry.

With regard to the authorization given to the Arabs return to their homes, the Times had reported the story of an Arab family who, on returning home, had found their house occupied by a family of immigrants from the Balkans.

At the present time South Africa and the Near East were the two areas of the world where the worst violations of human rights were occurring. In both cases the authorities responsible for the situation were Governments which repeatedly flouted the requests of the United Nations and continually defied it. The situation was probably more serious in South Africa, but the problem of the Middle East was unique inasmuch as the policy practised there was aimed at making refugees, even when all armed conflict had ceased. It was an extremely important question, which was manifestly related to the problem of the violation of human rights. The figures furnished by the High Commissioner for Refugees showed the extent of the tragedy - 800,000 refugees for the whole of the African continent, whereas there were almost double that number from Palestine alone. The Commissioner-General of UNWRA had pointed out that the number of refugees with whom his organization had been concerned before the recent hostilities had been 1,300,000 and that after the hostilities the number had increased by 400,000. The participants should study (the first two paragraphs of the section entitled "Human Rights and the Palestine Refugees") of the Note submitted by the Commissioner-General of the Agency (A/CONF.32/22).

The State of Israel had been established in 1948 by a decision of the United Nations. There had been some armed conflict but it had soon come to an end and an armistice commission had met on the Island of Rhodes. Even after the end of the hostilities, however, the flow of refugees had continued, to Damascus, Lebanon, the western sector of Jordan and the Gaza Strip. That mass exodus had in fact been deliberately induced, as was recognized by Mr. Menahim Begin, who boasted in his memoirs of having been alone responsible for driving 600,000 Arabs to seek refuge outside Palestine. Thanks to that systematic policy, Jaffa, an entirely Arab city, had become empty of its Arab inhabitants almost overnight.

Everything had been done deliberately. There had been little murdering, except for a few cases by so-called extremists, as at Deir Yassin and elsewhere. There had of course been the murder of Lord Moyne at Cairo, which had been a kind of warning

to the British, and that of Count Folke-Bernadotte, which had been a warning to the United Nations. For the most part, however, the Arabs had simply been frightened and made to abandon their homes. In the early days great care had been taken not to destroy villages or houses, since they had been needed to receive new immigrants. For the last ten months, however, demolition had been the common practice.

In December 1948 the General Assembly had stipulated in a resolution that refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so at the earliest practical date and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return. That resolution had been reaffirmed year after year but had never been implemented.

The exodus had been organized much more violently since the offensive of June 1967. The first victims of the Israel attack, curiously enough, had been the security troops of the United Nations. The Secretary-General had announced to the Assembly that Israel aircraft had bombed a convoy of troops, which had been displaying the usual United Nations colours and could be clearly distinguished from the height at which the bombers had been flying. That incident was typical of the attitude of the Israelis.

Their behaviour in the Gaza Strip was incompatible with respect for human rights. Michael Adams, a reporter of the Guardian, a newspaper whose pro-Zionist feelings were well known, had related that the Israel troops had opened fire in the streets of Gaza to intimidate the civilian population. In the camps, the Israelis had imposed a curfew for several days without previous warning. Sometimes they did not give any reason, but at other times they gave the pretext of reprisals. In one case a camp of 35,000 refugees had remained five days without food and two days without water, because a car containing Israel civilians had been mined nearby; the men had had to remain out of doors for seven hours, in one of the winter's severest storms, while Israel guards had fired over their heads. On another occasion, on the pretext that an unknown person had exploded a pétard near the Gaza fish market, the Israelis had stopped food supplies for four days to a camp where there were women and small children, and had compelled the men to spend twenty-four hours in a marsh without food or drink. Not satisfied with those harassments, they had blown up nine storehouses in which fishermen had kept their boats and tackle. In a similar incident at Gaza, the Israel soldiers had given the inhabitants ten minutes to evacuate their families before their houses had been demolished.

There again, those were acts observed by impartial witnesses, which had been reported in the Israel Press. An Israel officer, upon being told that his country did not respect the Geneva Convention which forbade collective punishment against civilians and the destruction of civilian property even in time of war, had replied that his soldiers did not like that work but that they were obliged to ensure security.

Most of the non-Jewish and non-Arab inhabitants of Gaza were convinced that there was no serious resistance in that zone. They found it hard to believe that the bomb incident in the Gaza market, in which thirty-five Arabs had been injured, could have been caused by an Arab. They considered that, if there was any danger, it came from the atmosphere of violence which the Israelis had created in order to compel the refugees to leave the Gaza Strip so that they could annex it more easily. The prisoners of war in Germany had been treated better than the Arab refugees, the majority of whom were women and children.

Mr. Gussing, the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, had confirmed that all men between the age of 18 and 55 had been imprisoned.

He would not go into details about what had happened in sectors other than the Gaza Strip, but would merely point out that the Israelis had driven hundreds of thousands of refugees across the Jordan and were opposing their return. In support of his statement, he quoted from the Note submitted by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. In spite of all the authority of the General Assembly and the Security Council, not more than 50 per cent of the refugees had been repatriated.

The Israelis tried to justify their action by invoking reasons of security. In the opinion of some neutral observers, like the correspondent of the Guardian, the punishment was out of all proportion to the offence. The Israelis tended to make exaggerated reports of the Arab attacks and resistance. Even if the reports were true, surely the population had the right to organize resistance to the invaders.

One of the items on the agenda of the Assembly for Human Rights which had met at Montreal had been the right to civil disobedience, rebellion and revolution. The report on the Jus Resistendi, which had been drawn up by an eminent Israel jurist, Haim H. Cohn, proclaimed that resistance to oppressive rule was no longer only a "sacred right" but had become an indispensable duty.

In conclusion, he apologized for having taken so long but pointed out that he had taken care to avoid politics and had limited his remarks to human rights. He hoped representatives would make a careful study of the documents supplied by the Secretariat,

namely, the Note submitted by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA; the Note entitled "Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in Occupied Territories" (A/CONF.32/27), which gave a list of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly on the fate of the civilian population in the territories occupied by Israel; and the Note by the Secretary-General (A/CONF.32/29).

Mr. AL FOZAN (Saudi Arabia) said that he wished that the representatives of the Arab States could make themselves heard as much as Israel. He reminded the racists that Shylock had owed his ruin to his greed. The Israelis gave the impression that their only purpose in attacking the Arab States had been to help them to raise their standard of living. The argument was typical of colonialist propaganda. It was well to recall that the United Nations had not given Israel a mandate to occupy Arab territories. The representative of Israel had accused the Arab States of committing aggression, but Israel had never managed to impose that point of view on the United Nations. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that the creation of the State of Israel was in itself an aggression. Nor should it be forgotten that it was the Israelis who had dropped napalm bombs on the civilian population. They quoted the Bible; but Satan himself could quote the Bible. The Moslems themselves abided by it. They respected the Holy Places and revered Moses. Their acts were in conformity with their principles.

Mr. DAUDY (Syria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, since the President, in spite of two points of order, had authorized the representative of Tel Aviv to dwell on the Palestine problem and Zionist colonization in Arab countries instead of adhering strictly to the agenda and to the implementation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, the representatives of the Arab countries intended to avail themselves of the same privilege and to exercise their right of reply without restriction, leaving their remarks on the item on the agenda until later. They apologized in advance for the time that it would take, but they thought that the Conference, which had heard the statement by the representative of the Zionist colonialists - a statement which added nothing new but a surfeit of arrogance - had the right and the duty to know the reply of the countries that were the victims of their aggression. On the previous day the Conference had condemned the resurgence of nazism in Europe; he thought that it should also condemn Zionism, a new form of nazism, which was as great a danger to world peace as Hitlerism had been.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.