



Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 40

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (continued) (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1, A/8472, A/8478, A/SPC/149, A/SPC/L.235)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had before it a draft resolution issued as document A/SPC/L.235. He suggested that delegations should exercise their right of reply only after all the speakers on the list had finished their statements.

2. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) regretted that the Committee had not had time to consider in greater detail all the aspects of the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) which irrefutably established that the Israeli authorities, using the most atrocious means of oppression, genocide and mass deportation, were pursuing their policy of annihilating Arab culture and the Arab way of life in the occupied territories, thus realizing their expansionist idea of creating a Jewish empire in the Middle East at the expense of the inalienable and universally recognized rights of the Palestinians and other Arab peoples. The policy of expansion and aggression was accompanied by a policy of terror and oppression in those territories which was directed against those who had decided not to obey the arbitrary law of the conqueror but to fight for their rights and for the liberation of their homeland. Regardless of what the official Israeli representatives said, the example of the Hitlerite régime was too alive in the memory of all the peoples of the world for them to fail to draw a parallel between the policies and practices of nazism and those of zionism.

3. The facts contained in the current report of the Special Committee threw light on the reasons why the Israeli Government had refused and continued to refuse to implement United Nations resolutions providing for a just political settlement of the whole Middle East crisis, why it did not respect the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and why it had practically rejected Mr. Gunnar Jarring's peace mission; in fact, it did not want a real solution because it intended to prevent a return to the previous conditions in the Middle East and had no intention of withdrawing from the Arab territories which had been occupied by force. By illegally occupying those territories and destroying their Arab character, Israel was trying to prejudice the solution and to

prepare for their lasting annexation, thereby expanding the so-called Jewish State in violation of international law.

4. For that purpose, the Israeli authorities were endeavouring by every available means to drive the Arab population from the occupied territories and settle Israeli citizens in their place, suppressing all resistance with torture and bloodshed. Her delegation wished to make it clear that, in speaking of atrocities against the Arab population and the freedom fighters, it did not identify official Israeli policy and the Zionist leaders with the Israeli people, who, like all the peoples of the world, were peace loving and were as much the victims of the aggressive, chauvinist, inhuman policy and war psychosis as were the Arabs.

5. Her delegation, like others, felt that the question of the rights and conditions of the Arab population in the Israeli-occupied territories was not merely a humanitarian question, but one of a highly political nature, and accepted without reservation all the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee, and specifically the recommendations in paragraph 91 of the report (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2). In addition, it requested the sponsors of the draft resolution which would be submitted on the question to include a paragraph requesting Israel to accept in practice and promptly implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and particularly the provision concerning the immediate withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories; that resolution currently represented the most effective means of ensuring respect for the human rights of the population in the occupied territories. Finally, her delegation wished to recommend that the Special Political Committee and the General Assembly should request the Office of Public Information to give the widest publicity to the facts contained in the report of the Special Committee, as it did in the case of information concerning the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa, and to provide in its work programme for more public information on the policy and practices through which Israel was destroying the Arab character of the occupied territories and depriving the population of its basic rights.

6. Mr. DAWOOD (Sudan) thanked the Special Committee for the report it had submitted to the Committee. The evidence which had been reaffirmed in the report brought out the main objective of the Zionists in the occupied Arab territories. The ill-treatment, demolition of houses, destruction of villages, mass arrest, deportation and intimidation of the Arab population were aimed at the annexation of the territories after the expulsion of their population and the elimination of those who resisted; that aim was clearly stated in paragraph 72 of the report of the Special Committee. In considering the item before the Committee, it should be borne in mind that the Zionist régime, in pursuance of its policy of annexation and expansion, would

continue to defy the resolutions in which the United Nations had condemned its policies and practices in the occupied territories.

7. If the Israeli authorities had refused to receive the Special Committee while the Arab countries had helped it to fulfil its mandate, it was because those authorities had something to hide from the international community and not, as they alleged, because of the prejudice of the Special Committee. As the report showed, the Special Committee had not involved itself in political issues; it had been concerned only with the humanitarian aspects of the problem. It had been pointless for the representative of Israel to claim, at the twenty-fifth session (748th meeting), that the Israeli Government was in possession of information with which it could refute the findings of the Special Committee, for he still had not produced that information.

8. How could the Committee believe that the conditions of the Palestinian refugees had improved under Israeli occupation, as the representative of Israel claimed, while the Fascist Israeli Government was applying a policy of deporting hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to camps in the desert, where they suffered the cruelty of the Zionist gangs and the border police who beat, tortured, robbed and killed Arab citizens, as had been admitted by the commander of those gangs and reported in *The Jerusalem Post* in February 1971? How could any credence be placed in the allegations of the Israeli representatives while the destruction of houses and villages continued and curfews of 22 hours a day were being imposed upon the refugees, who were living in camps owing to lack of space in the prisons?

9. In spite of the facts established in the report of the Special Committee, the Zionist representatives still insisted that the Arab population of the occupied territories enjoyed tranquility and prosperity and that its human rights were respected. But they were concealing their crimes against the Arab population in order to pave the way for the annexation of the occupied territories and the establishment of Jewish settlements in those territories. The Israeli Government did not conceal its intention to annex the occupied territories, and the Special Committee pointed out in paragraph 75 of its report that the policy pursued by Israel could have but one result: “the elimination of any possibility of the fulfilment of the Palestinian people’s right of self-determination within the confines of their own homeland”.

10. The plight of the Palestinians and the Arab population in the territories occupied by Israel was of concern not only to the Arab people, but to the whole of mankind, in whose interest it was to put an end to Israel’s Nazi-like policy of arrogant defiance. That could not be achieved unless Member States shouldered the responsibility for the emancipation and liberation of the Arab population of the occupied territories, since, as the Special Committee explained, in paragraph 83 of its current report, repeating the words of its first report,¹ “the fundamental violation of human rights lies in the very fact of occupation. The most effective way of safeguarding the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, therefore, is to end the occupation of these territories”.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, agenda item 101, document A/8089.*

11. Mr. SMIRNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the Special Committee had carried out a useful task despite the opposition of the Israeli authorities, and expressed his delegation’s gratitude to it.

12. It was apparent from the current report of the Special Committee (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) that Israel was pursuing a policy of annexation and was violating the human rights of the population in the occupied territories. As other delegations had pointed out, that policy was characterized by terror, repression, murder and offences against human dignity. Israeli practices were reminiscent of the behaviour of the Nazi armies in occupied Byelorussia during the Second World War.

13. No one who read the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422) and that of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories could fail to note certain similarities between the policies of racial and national superiority pursued by South Africa and by Israel. Paragraph 72 of the Special Committee’s report (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2) described the Zionist policy of territorial expansion and deportation of the Arab population, which was the official policy of the Israeli Government. That policy recalled South Africa’s policy of creating conditions so unbearable that they could only result in death or flight.

14. In the occupied territories, Israel was pursuing a policy similar to the South African Government’s policy of Bantustans. The Israeli Government had demarcated certain zones into which the Arabs were gathered and in which refugee camps, similar in concept to the Nazi concentration camps, were set up. According to Agence France-Presse, Israel was isolating the Gaza Strip by means of metal fences. In the refugee camps, force and terror reigned as a result of the actions of the notoriously cruel frontier police. In order to facilitate the police operations, an area such as the Gaza Strip was divided into sectors by means of metal fences, turning it into a concentration camp in which the inhabitants did not have the right to go from one sector to another. Curfews, murder, the demolition of houses and searches were everyday occurrences. The inhabitants were reduced to destitution and privation by lack of work and food.

15. The Israeli occupiers had set up three large internment camps in Sinai. Persons arrested under the Administrative Detention Act, similar to South Africa’s Terrorism Act, were sent to those camps. Under that Act anyone could be arrested without specific charges. The internment camps held not only detained individuals but entire families; approximately 6,000 persons were currently being held there. Was that not an Israeli version of the policy of Bantustans or the policies of *apartheid* pursued by South Africa?

16. While the opponents of *apartheid* were persecuted and maltreated in South Africa, similar persecution existed in the territories occupied by Israel. Paragraphs 63 to 67 of the Special Committee’s report revealed the kind of practices engaged in by the Israeli police; they exceeded even those of the South African police.

17. Just as South Africa was continuing to receive arms and technical assistance in spite of Security Council and

General Assembly resolutions, Israel, too, was benefiting from the co-operation of certain Western countries. The United States of America had recently given Israel assistance amounting to \$500 million. Not only did South African racism and Israeli zionism have many features in common, but the attitudes of the imperialist Powers towards them were identical.

18. The international community was familiar with the Israeli version of *apartheid* and knew about the cruel persecution to which Arabs were subjected in the territories occupied by Israel. The Zionists' chauvinism and racism were obvious everywhere in those territories, even in the discrimination directed against Jews from other countries. Those facts all bore witness to the existence of an Israeli version of *apartheid*. And since *apartheid* had been condemned by the international community as a violation of human rights and a crime against humanity, the Israeli authorities, too, were guilty of a similar crime.

19. After quoting paragraph 83 of the Special Committee's report, he recalled that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was assisting and would continue to assist the Arab countries in their struggle against imperialism and zionism, in order that the consequences of Israeli aggression might be quickly eliminated. It was convinced that the altruistic struggle of the Arab peoples would end in their victory.

20. Mr. MAHJOUBI (Morocco) expressed his gratitude to the Chairman of the Special Committee for his clear statement at the 799th meeting, which corroborated with new evidence what was stated in the report, and to the entire Committee for the moral and intellectual honesty with which it had carried out its mandate. The report was very enlightening regarding the inhuman practices of the Israeli Government affecting innocent populations, and the Special Political Committee should draw a parallel between the victims of nazism in the past and those of zionism in the present, in order to convince all members, even those who were still hesitating, that the victims of past persecution had learned well from the Nazis, as if to avenge themselves on other peoples.

21. In order to present those practices in their legal context, he referred to what the representative of Israel impudently called "security measures", namely, the Defence (Emergency) Regulations, the application of which had been extended to the occupied territories and certain articles of which eloquently showed how far the humiliation of people whose only crime was to be Arabs or Moslems could be carried. Regulation 110 stated that a Military Commander might by order direct that any person (meaning an Arab) should be placed under police supervision for a period not exceeding one year and that any person (meaning an Arab person) placed under police supervision should be subject to all or any of the following restrictions: he should be required to reside within the limits of the area specified by the Military Commander in the order; he should not be permitted to transfer his residence to any other area in the same police district without the written authority of the District Superintendent of Police; he should not leave the town, village or sub-district within which he resided without the written authority of the military governor, or travel without giving

full details of his movements, including the names of persons he planned to meet; he might be visited at his residence at any time by the police. Under regulation 125, a Military Commander might by order declare any area to be a closed area; any person who entered or left that area without a permit from the Military Commander was considered guilty of an offence against the regulations. Lastly, under regulation 129, a Military Commander might order any person to keep the military authorities informed of his movements or impose certain restrictions concerning his employment and his contacts with others, and even require him to report any information received from members of his family living in other districts.

22. That was the arsenal of laws by which Israeli lawmakers, who boasted of allowing the people in the occupied territories to enjoy all their rights, were in fact limiting their freedom of movement. In that connexion, the journalist Eric Rouleau reported that one of the best Israeli poets, Rashid Hussein, had never been allowed to visit Eilat or Safed and that the leader, Emile Habibi, was allowed to leave Nazareth only to travel to Jerusalem, the seat of the parliament of which he was a member.

23. The corollaries to those measures, which were supposedly justified by security considerations, were other ordinances for interpreting them, including the ordinances relating to the "land of absentee owners", which permitted the seizure of land and property. An eminent Zionist, Aharon Cohen, stated that the legislation concerning the property of absentee owners was being applied not only in rural areas but also in towns and that only persons of the Jewish religion were exempt from it; the rural property of absentee Arab owners living abroad or in Israel that had passed into Israeli hands included about 300 villages with an area of 750,000 dunams, of which about 80,000 dunams were citrus groves and over 200,000 dunams produced other crops. The urban property that had come under Israeli administration consisted of 25,416 buildings, 57,497 apartments and 10,729 commercial properties, shops and the like. Those figures were taken from the yearbook of the Israeli Government. He recalled in that connexion how the Israeli authorities, by their methods of intimidation and mass execution, were able to bring about "absences" through panic in the areas they wanted to colonize. Those ordinances were applicable not only to persons who had left the country but also to Wakf property, bequeathed by charitable persons to an institution which managed them for the benefit of needy persons. Mention might also be made of the ordinance on the cultivation of the best lands or the one on expropriations "for public purposes". Furthermore, where the legislative capacity for expulsion stopped, the military took over, dynamiting blocks of houses and whole villages and shooting peaceful citizens.

24. Co-operation between Israel and South Africa had reached the point where measures were being transplanted into Israel which placed the Arabs in the same circumstances as the Zulus in South Africa. As the American journalist Joseph Alsop had stated, Israel had forced itself to become a second South Africa, and the building of zionism was accompanied by a gradual movement towards a new kind of *apartheid*.

Mr. Smirnov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

25. Mr. KANOUTÉ (Mali) said that his delegation had noted with close attention the report of the Special Committee and its supplementary report (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) and wished to congratulate the Special Committee on doing everything within its power to carry out its mandate with laudable objectivity. In the face of Israeli practices in the occupied territories, his delegation could not help feeling a concern which was all the greater because those practices had been intensified throughout 1971. They included mass arrests; summary expulsions, deportations which were described in paragraph 49 of the report (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2) as a fact “established beyond all reasonable doubt”, which was “part of the Government of Israel’s policy”; transfers of population; prolonged and repeated curfews; the demolition of houses, or even of whole villages; physical violence and other maltreatment inflicted on detained persons, the most repugnant example of which was the case of Moayyad El-Bahsh, described in paragraph 64 of the report; the refusal to permit displaced persons to return to their homes; the annexation of the occupied territories and the establishment of Israeli colonies there, and the like. Those were grave and undeniable violations of human rights that no consideration could justify, in the view of his Government, which maintained diplomatic relations with Israel and therefore could not be accused of prejudice. He believed, furthermore, that Israel would have simplified matters and made it unnecessary for its representative to rebut the Special Committee’s reports in the Special Political Committee if it had co-operated with the Special Committee and allowed it to visit the occupied territories, in conformity with the appeals made to it by the General Assembly in resolutions 2443 (XXIII) and 2727 (XXV).

26. His delegation continued to believe that Israel’s current policy, far from ensuring the security that country sought, only served to aggravate the violence around it and would lead the Middle East and the world to disaster. It shared the view of the Special Committee, expressed in paragraph 83 of its report, that “the fundamental violation of human rights lies in the very fact of occupation”. There would not be peace in the Middle East until Israel evacuated all the occupied Arab territories. In the meantime, Israel should end the expulsion, transfers and deportation of people, the destruction of houses and villages, and all policies aimed at annexing and establishing Israeli settlements in occupied territories, and it should withdraw its refusal to allow all those who had fled or been deported or expelled from the occupied territories to return to their homes.

27. His delegation was pleased that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) had stated that it was ready to assume all the functions of a Protecting Power under the Geneva Convention in the occupied territories of the Middle East (see A/8389/Add.1, para. 36). It hoped that that decision would help to ensure the full implementation in those territories of all the provisions of the international instruments concerning respect for human rights.

28. He then briefly introduced the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.235) submitted by his country, of which Mauritania was also a sponsor. Basically it called upon Israel, in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5, to modify its policy in the

occupied Arab territories, and to agree to co-operate with the Special Committee, which, in operative paragraph 1, was commended for its efforts and in operative paragraphs 6 and 10 was requested to continue its work with the co-operation of ICRC. He very much hoped that the Committee would support the draft resolution.

Mr. Cremin (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

29. Mr. BAHADUR SINGH (India) said that he appreciated the efforts made by the Special Committee despite the lack of co-operation from the Israeli occupation authorities. He wished to refer to two basic matters of principle. In a note verbale addressed to the Secretary-General on 7 April 1971 (see A/8389, para. 14), the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations had questioned the establishment of the Special Committee on the basis of resolution 2727 (XXV), objecting that that resolution had been “adopted by a minority of the General Assembly”. However, Security Council resolution 298 (1971), adopted by 14 votes to none with 1 abstention, stated in paragraph 3 that “all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, including expropriation of land and properties, transfer of populations and legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section, are totally invalid and cannot change that status”. In pursuance of that resolution, the Secretary-General, in his report² of 19 November 1971, on the implementation of that resolution, had stated that in the light of the failure of the Government of Israel to abide by the decision of the Security Council he had not been able to fulfil his mandate under the resolution.

30. Contrary to the facts, Israel claimed that it had given free access. How free that access was could be gauged from the letter of transmittal in the Special Committee’s report, which stated that “the Government of Israel’s refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee and allow it access to the occupied territories has constituted a major obstacle in the discharge of its mandate”. The International Red Cross, which had had access to the occupied areas, had confirmed that interrogation procedures frequently involved physical violence; the Special Committee had already made reference to that source of information in paragraph 77 of its report.

31. The establishment of settlements for Israeli Jews in the occupied territories was in contravention of international law. The deportation of persons from the occupied territories was contrary to article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the destruction of houses of persons suspected of helping the resistance violated articles 33 and 53 of that Convention.

32. His delegation had consistently held the view that Israeli occupation of Arab territory, in spite of numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, was in itself a flagrant violation of human rights. The problem of the refugees and their return to their homes and the question of investigating Israeli practices affecting human rights could not be separated from the basic question of the

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971, document S/10392.*

illegal occupation of Arab territories by Israel. At each session, the representative of Israel attempted to divert the Committee's attention from the disturbing evidence which the Special Committee had produced: how could Israel refuse to co-operate with the Special Committee, on the one hand, and challenge its source of information, on the other? His Government rejected all Israeli excuses for not withdrawing from the territories occupied as a result of the 1967 aggression and thought that the Special Committee should continue its work so that the Israeli practices would continue to be exposed.

33. The Reverend NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) said that he would speak in the same spirit as he had a year previously when he had visited Jerusalem, namely as a Christian whose heart was full of love for both Jews and Arabs. During his stay in the Holy Land, he had come into contact with many Arabs from various backgrounds and had taken part with Jews, Moslems and Christians in common activities, in a spirit of fraternity and respect for the political views of all. He had returned convinced that the human groups in that region could live together in peace. He had been travelling with a young Arab from the eastern sector of Jerusalem when his car had skidded into a ditch; he had been able to extricate it with the help of his young companion and an Israeli who had come with his tractor from a nearby kibbutz. The incident had strengthened his optimism for the future: he had seen it as a symbol of union between the different communities and had remembered that President Bourguiba had previously proposed the establishment of a large-scale federation in the Middle East.

34. When he heard talk in the Committee of blood and death, he wondered whether his visit to Israel had been a dream or whether some representatives did not have reasons for presenting a tendentious picture of a situation he himself had seen in a very different light. He trusted the official representatives of the Israeli Government when they stated publicly that they did not want annexation, whatever might be said by fanatics, who, in Israel as in other countries, had lost all sense of justice or history. He had had an opportunity to visit Hebron, Nablus, Samaria and Jericho, where he had seen houses built by the United Nations abandoned by the families who had fled after 1967. He had spoken everywhere with the Arab inhabitants: military occupation was of course never desirable and everyone wished to see it end. But they also saw that the occupation went hand in hand with a development of the country which they expected would benefit them later. The agricultural services of the Israeli Government had taught new methods to the peasants who were proud of the results obtained with modern seeding machines and improved fertilizers. Public hygiene had been improved, as was shown by the speed with which a recent cholera epidemic had been controlled. Educational institutions had never been closed and the Arabs in the environs of Bethlehem had requested that a university be established at Ramallah, a step which a member of the Israeli Cabinet had described in his presence as an investment for peace. The seasonal population movements across the Allenby bridge were subject to formalities which all travellers, at all borders, found irksome. As to political freedom, it should not be forgotten that Israel was the most democratic society in existence; although its relations with socialist countries were far from good, there were two Communist parties in

Israel whose members sat in the Knesset. The Government was often criticized: recently, incidents which had occurred during house searches in the Gaza area had led to energetic protests in university circles and the inquiry which had been demanded had resulted in the punishment of the guilty persons. He considered religion to be a necessary element in life and had the greatest admiration for the profoundly religious spirit of the Moslems of the Near East, whom he had seen carrying out their religious duties. The year before he himself had been at Bethlehem, where 20,000 Christians from the Middle East and the whole world had gathered on Christmas Eve. The Israeli authorities had tried to create the best conditions for their pilgrimage, and since the Church of the Nativity could not hold them all, large television screens had been used to show the ceremonies outside and a recording had been sent to Europe to be retransmitted by Telstar to all the countries in the world.

35. If he had had the financial means, he would have liked to demonstrate all those facts to the representatives in the Committee who drew a horrible picture of life in the Middle East. Any abnormal situation was accompanied by unpopular measures aimed at protecting the lives of the citizens: there were examples of that in all countries, although the ideals sought were different. Because of the abnormality of the situation in the Middle East the Committee should avoid any preconceived ideas in its debates especially since they suffered from a constant imbalance in the forces on either side.

36. The Special Committee's composition, its working conditions and the content of its report (A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) were limited and reservations could perhaps be made concerning the veracity of the Special Committee's documents and the objectivity of its members, who seemed to be more interested in propaganda goals than the safeguarding of human rights. Moreover, it was questionable whether ICRC should be associated with the Special Committee's activities, since ICRC might unwillingly find itself implicated in political manoeuvring. It was particularly regrettable that the word "zionism" was used in the report since it was used abusively: it was always dangerous to give words an emotional content. In his opinion, the membership of the Special Committee should first be changed: in order to ensure equity, its members should not all come from countries hostile to Israel: at least one of the three countries designated should be chosen from among the countries which maintained good relations with Israel. Further, the Special Committee's terms of reference would benefit from being revised and broadened to cover all the peoples of the Near East, whatever the country or the authority responsible for violating the human rights of those people. Above all, no position should be taken before the facts had been studied objectively, if lack of sincerity was not to prevent a valid outcome.

37. In conclusion, he requested those whom he might have offended to forgive him and to see in his words only an expression of his profound conviction and of a sincere desire to see all human beings in the Middle East live in peace.

38. Mr. MIKUCKI (Poland) thanked the Special Committee for the complete, objective and impartial report it

had submitted to the Committee. He then noted the defiant attitude the Israeli Government had adopted with regard to the United Nations resolutions in refusing to receive the Special Committee and in challenging its impartiality and integrity. On the basis of the evidence submitted by the Special Committee, it was clear that the Israeli Government was pursuing policies and practices which violated the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, as the Special Committee observed in the fifth paragraph of the letter of transmittal in document A/8389 and Corr.1 and 2. His delegation wished to stress that the policies marked by collective punishment, ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees, expulsions and deportations, destruction or confiscation of houses and buildings which were noted in the Special Committee's report were at variance with the principles of contemporary international law and the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

39. His delegation shared the opinion expressed by the Special Committee in paragraph 83 of its report: "The fundamental violation of human rights lies in the very fact of occupation. The most effective way of safeguarding the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, therefore, is to end the occupation of these territories". It also wished to draw attention to paragraph 72 of the report of the Special Committee, in which the latter revealed that the Israeli authorities intended to proceed from the illegal occupation to the illegal annexation of the Arab territories. The international community should be aware of the Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Arab territories and should exert strong pressure on the Israeli authorities to put an end to those policies and practices.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.