

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

MEETING

Wednesday, 6 December 1972,
at 3.50 p.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/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.260)

1. Mr. ALEEM (Pakistan) recalled that Israel, as an occupying Power, had an obligation, until its aggression was vacated, to act in accordance with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, the security and welfare of the inhabitants of the occupied territories were the responsibility of Israel, as had been repeatedly affirmed by the United Nations, particularly in General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) and Security Council resolutions 237 (1967) and 259 (1968). It was Israel's complete disregard of all norms of international law applicable to situations of occupation that had led the General Assembly to establish the Special Committee. That Committee had been unable to perform its functions because Israel had refused to co-operate with it and even denied it entry into the occupied territories. The reason was that Israel feared that its claim of giving just and fair treatment to the people under its occupation would not bear public scrutiny. In fact, the Special Committee had concluded that Israel was engaged in a policy designed to effect radical changes in the physical character and demographic composition of several areas of the territories under its occupation and making deliberate efforts to eradicate any Palestinian national identity. That policy of annexation and settlement, deportation and demolition, expropriation and administrative detention and denial of the right of the civilians who had fled from their homes during and after the Israeli aggression of 1967 to return to their homes had been confirmed by the International Committee of the Red Cross as well.

2. Israel was perpetrating a travesty of law when it tried to justify its policy on a plea of reasons of security and to transform into a fixed policy a provision of international law meant for exceptional circumstances. His delegation fully agreed with the Special Committee that the civilian population had certain inalienable rights which could not be derogated from. Israel must rescind all its illegal actions and desist in future from the policies and practices it was pursuing in defiance of world opinion. Moreover, occupation itself was con-

trary to the Charter of the United Nations and to Security Council resolution 237 (1967); Israel should therefore immediately and unconditionally withdraw from the Arab territories, since the acquisition of territory by force was inadmissible.

3. He introduced a revised version of draft resolution A/SPC/L.258 and read out a number of changes made in the text. The revised draft resolution (A/SPC/L.258/Rev.1) was sponsored by Afghanistan, Guinea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania and Pakistan.

4. In operative paragraph 2 of the English text the words "all policies and practices, such as" had been replaced by "all such policies and practices as". The sponsors had added a new operative paragraph 11 reading as follows: "Requests the Special Committee to report to the Secretary-General as soon as possible and whenever the need arises thereafter;". The earlier operative paragraphs 11 and 12 had been renumbered accordingly. The draft resolution was very similar to the corresponding resolution of the previous session, except for a few changes, particularly in operative paragraphs 5 and 8, subparagraphs (e) and 8 (f), made in order to take account of developments in the situation.

5. Miss DINÇER (Turkey) expressed regret at the fact that, for the third year in a row, the Special Committee had had to report that in spite of numerous United Nations resolutions and recommendations adopted since 1967, Israel still continued to occupy territories belonging to three neighbouring Arab States and still pursued its practices and policies of annexation through the demolition of houses and entire villages, the construction of large housing projects in the occupied territories, the deportation of the civilian population and expropriation of their property and the encouragement of Israeli settlement in the occupied territories, to the point of changing the geographic character and demographic composition of those territories. In view of the grave nature of the matter, the Security Council had called urgently upon Israel in September 1971—by its resolution 298 (1971)—to rescind all previous measures and actions and to take no further steps to change the status of the City of Jerusalem or prejudice the rights of its inhabitants and the interests of the international community.

6. With regard to the occupation of the Arab territories, her delegation had repeatedly declared, in various United Nations bodies, as before the General Assembly on 1 December 1972 (2095th plenary meeting), that it could not accept the acquisition of territory or political advantage through the use of force, nor could it tolerate

the measures taken by Israel with a view to changing the status of Jerusalem and other occupied territories through faits accomplis, and had voted in favour of all resolutions to that effect since 1967. In her delegation's view, the continued occupation and the measures taken in the occupied Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian territories were detrimental to efforts aimed at establishing peace and security in the region. The establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), was the main objective and the surest guarantee of respect for human rights in the area.

7. Her delegation regarded foreign occupation as a breach of the principles of international law and a violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and was convinced that the fundamental violation of human rights lay in the very fact of occupation and that the most effective way of safeguarding the human rights of the population of the occupied territories was, therefore, to end the occupation, as called for in Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

8. Since Israel persisted in refusing to co-operate with the Special Committee, her delegation believed that, pending an over-all solution of the problem of the Middle East that would terminate the occupation itself, it was important to find some interim means for safeguarding the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. In that connexion, her delegation hoped that the parties concerned would agree to let the International Committee of the Red Cross assume the role of a Protecting Power in accordance with the second paragraph of article 11 of the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949,¹ which was the main instrument applicable to the occupied territories. It associated itself with the appeal made by the Special Committee in paragraph 98 of its report (A/8828) and emphasized that the rights of several thousand innocent persons living under military occupation should be a matter of primary concern to the international community.

9. Mr. ŠIGUT (Czechoslovakia) observed that the Israeli Government was continuing to disregard the many resolutions, including in particular resolution 2851 (XXVI) of the General Assembly in which the Assembly called upon it to co-operate with the Special Committee and to facilitate its entry into the occupied territories; on the contrary, Israel was doing everything it could to prevent the Special Committee from carrying out its task. Nevertheless, the Special Committee had given an objective picture of the situation in the Near East and had described in its report many examples of systematic and deliberate violations of the fourth Geneva Convention by Israeli troops and occupation authorities, including mass expulsions of inhabitants, deportation to neighbouring Arab countries and establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. Furthermore, evidence gathered by the Special Committee agreed with the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/8713 and Corr.1) which

mentioned acts of oppression committed by the Israeli armed forces, such as the demolition of refugees' homes, particularly in the Gaza Strip. Such actions constituted flagrant violations of the fourth Geneva Convention and of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations and were part of a deliberate policy of destruction and expansion. The report of the Special Committee and other evidence clearly showed that Israel, heedless of the United Nations, was pursuing its expansionist aims. Moreover, the statement made on 16 June 1972 by the Prime Minister of Israel, in which she had said that Israel would not hesitate to deport the Arabs of the occupied territories if Israel's interests required it, left no doubt about that policy of aggression. In addition, Israel Galili, Chairman of the Ministerial Committee for the Settlement of the Occupied Territories, had stated in July 1972 that Israel had placed no limits on Jewish settlement, and, according to Israeli sources, 44 Jewish settlements had been established in the occupied territories since the war of June 1967.

10. The specific conclusions made by the Special Committee in its report (see A/8828, paras. 83 to 99) were based on the application of the Geneva Convention and on the desire to guarantee respect for the fundamental and inalienable human rights of the civilian population of the occupied territories, as provided in that Convention. Moreover, his delegation was convinced that the fundamental violation lay in the occupation itself and that the only possible remedy would be the systematic application of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which formed the acceptable basis for a settlement of the conflict and would take account of the interests of all the peoples of the region. A prerequisite to the re-establishment of peace in the Middle East was the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied territories.

11. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq) noted that the great majority of delegations that had spoken on the item under consideration had condemned the practices followed by Israel in the occupied territories. Yet the representative of Israel had spoken (849th meeting) of the situation in the areas administered by Israel as flourishing and peaceful, painting the unprecedented picture of a new Eden flourishing under foreign occupation, a society where the human rights of the population were fully preserved, an open society, enjoying calm and tranquillity, in which the economy, housing, educational facilities and other social services were improving and in which all freedoms were assured to everybody. According to the representative of Israel, that veritable paradise had been visited over the years by "hundreds of thousands of people, political figures, clergymen, writers, journalists and tourists", as well as by diplomats, all of whom had confirmed in reports—described by that representative as too numerous to mention—that the occupied territories presented a picture of a "most liberal and humane" administration.

12. Such a glowing description should compel even the most jaded to probe deeper and ascertain the actual advantages of Israeli military occupation. He proposed

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

to begin with Gaza, Arab for more than a millenium and the birthplace of Imam al Shafei, the founder of the Shafei school of Moslem jurisprudence by which 100 million Moslems throughout the world were guided. In 1948 Gaza had had to accomodate 190,000 Palestinian refugees. Subsequently, it had experienced a first Israeli invasion in 1956 and another Israeli occupation in 1967 which had lasted to the current day. In 1967 the total population of the Gaza Strip had been about 400,000 persons. Sulayman Abdullah Schleifer, a correspondent for the periodical *Jeune Afrique*, described in *The Arab World* of London how the Israelis had dealt with overpopulation in the Gaza Strip in 1968:

“The Israeli announcement in January that Jews now have the right to purchase Arab land in the Gaza Strip came at the height of a mass terror campaign designed to empty the Strip of its Arab inhabitants. I was told by local people that more than 50,000 Arabs have been driven out since the war. During my last visit to Gaza, a number of residents described to me how Israeli Army officials had called a meeting in early December of Gaza refugee camp leaders and ordered them to lead the refugees out of the Gaza Strip and into the now deserted UNRWA camps in the west bank of Jericho. When the camp leaders refused to comply with the order, an Israeli terror campaign swept the area. More than 100 Gaza houses have been blown up in recent months under the guise of combating Arab terrorism . . . thousands of Arab youths from the refugee camps have been rounded up, detained, beaten, left for hours lying on the open beach at machine-gun point until half-submerged by incoming tides. Refugee camps have been subject to sudden total curfew, cut off from food and other supplies for two or three days straight . . . A state of tension, terror and dismay reigns over Gaza . . . When grenades are tossed at Israeli jeep patrols, it is above all a case of elementary self-defence on the part of a clearly threatened community.”

13. Lest it be thought that the situation had improved since 1968, he quoted from an article published in October 1971 in *Middle East International* of London by Mr. Carol Johnson, a member of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, who had visited the Gaza Strip as a member of a United Kingdom parliamentary delegation:

“During our stay we had the opportunity of judging ‘the resettlement and construction work’ on which the Israelis claim they are engaged . . . but having seen what had been done in some of the camps and discussed the position both with Israeli officials and Arabs I learned nothing firm and definite about ‘resettlement’ but saw a good deal of evidence about destruction and dispersal . . . In our earlier interview with an Israeli official I had tried to ascertain what future the authorities had in mind for these refugees. I was assured that in due course when new buildings had been constructed in Gaza they would be allowed to come back; but there were no signs of any such buildings nor indeed did there

appear to be any specific proposals, and certainly so far as the displaced Arabs were concerned nothing had been said to them about their return . . . Indeed the ruthless destruction of sections of the camp seemed rather to indicate an intention to reduce them in size permanently . . . Few people except journalists and such get to Gaza, but I learned enough in a short stay to convince me the United Nations should interest itself without further delay and despatch an independent commission to the area so that a full report can be published of what has been happening there and the future needs of all the displaced refugees will be properly met.”

14. That was in 1971, it was true, but the situation did not seem to be very different in 1972; *The Times* of London, in an editorial published on 26 May 1972, had stated that numerous Israeli settlements were being established in the Gaza Strip, which, according to Mrs. Meir, “will never again be detached from Israel”.

15. The representative of Israel had praised the liberalism of the occupying authorities, which allowed young Arabs to continue their studies in Egypt and other Arab countries. As he had already had occasion to point out at the preceding session, the representative of Israel had overlooked the fact that those students were leaving the territory with an exit visa but without a re-entry visa. The advantages of that policy were, according to General Dayan, that it would rid Gaza of those youths and that, as experience showed, once they had a profession, they would not return but would be absorbed in the Arab countries (interview published in *The Jerusalem Post* and quoted in *The Guardian* of London of 2 January 1970). That depopulation policy explained why travel agencies, some of them subsidized by the Government, were offering to finance the journey to South America, particularly Brazil, of any young people willing to emigrate and unable to afford it, a fact confirmed by the *Israc* on 2 March 1970.

16. The situation in Gaza thus appeared grim. The representative of Israel had painted a glowing picture of the situation on the West Bank, stating that, after years of economic stagnation, unemployment had disappeared, agriculture was flourishing and wage levels were high. What was the real position of Arab workers in Israel and the occupied territories, as depicted by the Israeli press? The *Ha'aretz* of 26 November 1971 had reported that in Jaffa the market where Arabs waited to be hired by Jewish employers was known popularly as the “Slave Market” and that some kinds of manual work were being done only by Arabs; for example, the “Asis” tinned-food factory employed young Arab girls who looked as if they were barely 12 years old. The *Yedioth Ahronoth* of 14 November 1971 had pointed out the advantages of hiring Arab workers, who had no trade unions and never went on strike; furthermore, a quarter of the pay of an Arab worker was deducted, and there was a strong likelihood that the money, which was being accumulated by the Israeli Government, would not all be repaid. It was not surprising, therefore, that, as reported in the *Ma'ariv* of 27 October 1971, there was a great majority

of Arab workers in factories, in subordinate positions, since the Jewish workers refused to take orders from an Arab. Charles Douglas-Home, writing in *The Times* of London on 29 November 1972 described how the Israeli press had denounced abusive labour practices caused by the employment of Arab workers in Israel itself: agricultural work performed by Arab children 10 or 12 years of age and the hiring "on spec" of Palestinians without work permits at Haifa and Nazareth. Furthermore, about 1,000 Arabs who were Israeli citizens were restricted to their places of residence, mostly in Galilee, although not charged with any specific offence. In some instances, those restrictive measures had been enforced for 16 years.

17. The representative of Israel had assured the members of the Committee that the destruction described in the Special Committee's report was extremely limited. Yet in Gaza alone, 15,000 persons had been displaced because of the demolition of houses. In Jerusalem, almost all of the Old City was considered to be hallowed ground by one or other of the three major religions for which the city was sacred, and it therefore seemed unlikely that wide-scale demolition would be carried out there. However, *The Guardian* of 29 April 1972 had shattered that illusion. According to the Israelis' master plan for Jerusalem, by 1975 the 70,000 Arabs living in the eastern part of Jerusalem would be outnumbered owing to the settlement of more than 100,000 Jews, whose physical presence would obliterate the Arab claim based on the abstract legality of immemorial possession of the land. Before 1948 some 80 per cent of the residents in the Jewish quarter had been Arabs; they were now in the process of being expelled. Officially they were leaving their homes of their own free will, with "handsome" compensation. In reality all sorts of subterfuges were being used to drive them away. It was easy to make a resident leave his home when all was being demolished around him, perhaps even including part of his house, which could then be declared "unsafe". Intimidation was also used; the newspaper described how a municipal official had decorated his office with weapons and ammunition. There were even more ignoble subterfuges, as in the case of the house owner who had protested at the sight of a squad of soldiers and workmen who had come to destroy his house and had been told to see the Mayor of Jerusalem himself; upon returning home bearing a stay of execution, he had found that his house no longer existed.

18. The Israeli representative had said that the press enjoyed full freedom and had quoted in support of his statement, as he always did, Mr. Abu-Shilbaya, a Palestinian Arab writer who never tired of praising Israeli democracy and its benevolent treatment of the Arabs. There were, of course, always "collaborators" under every occupation. But why did the representative of Israel not mention what had happened to Naim El-Ashhab, an intellectual of eastern Jerusalem who, by order of the military authorities, had been kept in prison for 38 months, 13 of them in solitary confinement, without any charge being made against him? He had been pressed to leave his native town of Jerusa-

lem and offered his liberty if he would agree, but he had "freely" consented to leave only after going blind in prison and had been "liberated" on that condition. His case, which was by no means unique, had been brought to the attention of the international community by Mr. Israel Shahak, President of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights. Nor should the case of Mohammed Yusef Sadik, who had written an excellent play in Hebrew on Arab-Jewish relations, which the theatre group of the University had decided to perform, be passed over in silence. Soon after the first performance, the play had been banned and the author arrested. He had not been freed until he had promised to emigrate to the United States of America. Mr. Doron should know that the Israeli Jewish satirist Shimon Tzabar had been dismissed from the "liberal" Israeli newspaper for which he had been working for having urged the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories. He had subsequently emigrated to the United Kingdom, where he was publishing a satirical newspaper entitled *Israel Imperial News* which described the transformation of Israel into a totalitarian military State. Mr. John P. Richardson, Executive Director of the American Near East Refugee Aid, had published a review in *The Washington Post* of 28 January 1972 on the situation in the Middle East in which he had shown that the military occupation had had a devastating effect on the life of 1 million Arabs. They were no longer masters in their own homes and, as Israel, according to the Zionist philosophy, must be a Jewish State, the presence of the Arabs was in itself an obstacle to that plan, as the Israeli author Amos Elon recognized in his book *The Israelis: Founders and Sons*.²

19. In its worst form, the occupation could mean the destruction of houses, deportation and even summary execution. But the occupation could also take on more subtle forms. For example, farm produce from the West Bank entering Jerusalem was taxed as a foreign import, whereas Israeli products going to the other bank were free from such taxes; an export permit could be obtained only through an Israeli middleman, and so on. The occupation might take even more subtle forms: for example, the Arab part of Jerusalem was being steadily encircled by buildings erected for Jewish inhabitants to guarantee a Jewish majority; the Arabs in all occupied territories were required to have distinctive licence plates, telephone numbers and post-office box numbers, and an increasing number of signs were printed in Hebrew only. As the anguish and bitterness on the West Bank and in Jerusalem had not yet exploded into violence, as they had in Gaza, tourists described those places as model occupied areas, whereas in Gaza the repression of the population was conducted without witnesses. The sympathy which the Israelis derived in Western countries from the events of the Second World War enabled them to perpetuate a situation which, ironically enough, recalled in many ways that which they themselves had had to endure in those tragic hours of their history.

² New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

20. All that evidence corroborated, if such corroboration was needed, the conclusions of the report of the Special Committee. The representative of Israel might continue to decry its members, and more particularly its Chairman, but would not succeed in hurting the reputation for integrity of the Special Committee, which was endeavouring to fulfil a difficult task. In paragraph 5 of its report (A/8828), the Special Committee stated it had acquired graphic evidence in the form of films on the human rights of the population of occupied territories. His delegation hoped that the Special Political Committee would consider the possibility of showing those films for the benefit of its members and of all the representatives who would consider the situation in the Middle East in the General Assembly in plenary meeting. The showing of those films could be announced in the *Journal of the United Nations*.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that he had noted the suggestion of the representative of Iraq and that the Secretariat would take the appropriate steps.

22. He proposed that the general debate should be closed and the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.258/Rev.1 postponed until the next meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 38

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (concluded)* (A/8666 and Corr.1, A/8670, A/8689, A/8703, paras. 501-519; A/SPC/L.157, A/SPC/L.257, A/SPC/L.259):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1 and 2, A/8770 and Add.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8822, A/8833)

23. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to revert to consideration of item 38 of the agenda and announced that Yugoslavia and Tunisia had also joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.257. The Secretary-General's note (A/SPC/L.259) contained a statement of the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution.

24. Mr. AHMAD (India) wished to make a small amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.257. The word "*appreciation*" should be substituted for the word "*satisfaction*" and at the end of the paragraph, after the word "meetings", the phrase "of the proposed Conference of Trade Unions against *Apartheid* and the Preparatory Committee for the Conference" should be added. He announced that Jordan and Senegal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution and asked that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

25. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, as orally modified.

At the request of the representative of India, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Ecuador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: France, Greece, Malawi, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, as amended, was adopted by 99 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

26. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.257 because it approved the general tenor of the text. However, it might be recalled with reference to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 that the Norwegian trade unions were totally independent organizations. Thus when they received an appeal from international organizations, they took their decision in the light of the merits of the appeal and of their traditional attitude towards the question concerned. But since the Norwegian trade unions were against all forms of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, he was confident that they would respond favourably to the appeal in the resolution just adopted.

27. Mr. PETRIE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.257 for essentially the same reason, as it had abstained from voting on resolution 2775 H (XXVI), namely the financial implications and the inappropriateness of asking the specialized agencies to engage in political action in contradiction to their constitutions.

28. Mr. SCHERER (United States of America) said that for budgetary and organizational reasons, his

* Resumed from the 852nd meeting.

delegation had reservations concerning draft resolution A/SPC/L.257. But in spite of those reservations, because of its stand against *apartheid* it had not opposed the draft resolution and had merely abstained from voting.

29. Mr. ORTONA (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, since it shared the views expressed in that text. But it would like to make a reservation in respect of the financial implications of the draft.

30. Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) said that his delegation had previously abstained from voting on draft resolutions concerning the participation of trade unions in the struggle against *apartheid*. If the United Nations saw fit to approach not only the Governments of States but also trade unions, the cause at issue should be a lofty one, as the struggle against *apartheid* indeed was. However, it was to be feared that on the basis of that precedent, the same means might one day be placed at the service of questionable causes. In spite of those reservations, based on questions of principle, his delegation had felt called upon to vote for draft resolution A/SPC/L.257 because of its ultimate objectives.

31. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) said that he had had to make a statement at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly and hence had been unable to be

present during the voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.257. But he would like to state that the delegation of Costa Rica had had the intention of voting in favour of the draft in view of its purposes and because it approved the idea that trade unions should be associated with the struggle against *apartheid*.

32. Mr. AHMAD (India) said that he had some difficulty in understanding the attitude of those abstaining. They reminded him of the passage in the First Book of Kings which read: "And Elijah came unto all the people and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word."

33. The delegations that had abstained from voting were in fact those listed in annex II to the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722)—which threw some light on the reasons for their abstention. Considering that some of those countries were among the richest in the world, and that foreign investment in South Africa in 1970 had amounted to \$8,000 million, one wondered how they could justify their abstention by citing financial considerations of a matter of \$10,000 when it was largely a vote on a question of morality.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had now completed its consideration of agenda item 38.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.