



UN/DA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOUASSI (Togo)

later: Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 71: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/41/SR.30
20 November 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 71: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/41/454, 455 and Add.1, 456, 469 and Add.1, 677, 680, 681, 682)

1. Mr. MAKSOUD (Observer, League of Arab States) said that the Israeli practices in the occupied territories were inevitable, because they were an inherent part of Zionism. Israel itself represented the partial fulfilment of Zionist objectives.

2. Israeli policy was manifested in the very language the Zionists used. The settlements were referred to as "Jewish villages" so as to lend them a kind of permanency and thereby pave the way for full-fledged annexation. The term "public domain" used to describe the establishment of settlements ignored the question of sovereignty, although the United Nations had declared that the Palestinians were the ultimate owners of the land. Instead of referring to the occupied territories by their names, in Israeli parlance they became either "liberated territories" - in which case it might be asked from whom they had been liberated, if not from their rightful Palestinian inhabitants - "Judea and Samaria", the "administered territories" or simply "the territories", as if they belonged to no one and as if the Israelis had an equal or greater right to decide the question of sovereignty over them than the Palestinians themselves. The ultimate Israeli objective in introducing such terms was to disfranchise the population.

3. References to the "benevolence" of the Israeli occupation were reminiscent of colonialism, and implied that social and economic benefits were a compensation for the denial of human rights. The Israeli occupation was indeed a colonizing process and was predicated upon an exclusivist racist ideology. There were those in the United States who wished to do away with the resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racism. But a State that excluded non-Jews was guilty of institutionalized racial discrimination. The Israeli representative's reference to improvements in the infrastructure and quality of life in the occupied territories concealed the fact that the aim of such improvements was to enable those territories to absorb more settlers.

4. The Arabs and Palestinians were not against coexistence with the Jews. In fact, in the late 1960s, the Palestine Liberation Movement had advocated a secular democratic State and had reconciled itself to Jewish presence in Palestine. Such a solution had not been accepted, because it supposedly would have meant "suicide for the Jewish State", and yet it would have cleared the way for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Unfortunately, basic Zionist ideology had always viewed the population as an obstacle to the creation of an Eretz Yisrael. Accordingly, a United Nations conference on the Middle East must be convened to enforce the relevant United Nations resolutions on the right of self-determination and to prevent the Israeli occupation from acting as a continuing impediment to a Middle East settlement.

5. Mr. SHEKAR (United Arab Emirates) said that 1967 had seen the initiation of the policy aimed at annexing the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights to the other parts of Palestine taken by the Zionist forces in 1948. Israeli policy in the occupied territories was in effect aimed at liquidating the presence of the Palestinian people with a view to the total Judaization of those territories and the establishment of permanent Israeli control. In furtherance of that objective, the boundaries of the Arab city of Jerusalem had been extended to include large parts of the West Bank. A programme had also been prepared for the Judaization of Galilee, aimed at breaking up the Palestinian community. The "Protocols of Galilee" had been drawn up in 1973 in order to intensify the policy of human, commercial, industrial and military settlement in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, in preparation for their annexation.

6. According to a detailed report by Meron Benvenisti, a former Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, by 1982 the Israeli Government had gained control of over 50 per cent of the territory of the West Bank outside the city of Jerusalem. However, there had been changes in the nature of the settlements since Begin's time. Indeed, having recently elaborated a new concept, the Israeli Government had begun to focus on extensive settlements, establishing a strong link between the West Bank and the main populated areas. According to Benvenisti, the objective of that manoeuvre went further than mere annexation and control; it was aimed at turning those settlements into "the dormitories of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv", which would in turn transform the Arab towns and villages into a ghetto surrounded by Jewish dormitory suburbs, settlements and camps. Moreover, the Jewish areas would be provided with all facilities and services, being allowed to hold elections and enjoy freedom of expression, while the Arab ghetto would be controlled by "the military government" or the "civilian administration". A number of sources indicated that Israeli government officials had corroborated the information supplied by Benvenisti.

7. That deliberate policy had had devastating effects in the occupied territories. The economy of the West Bank and Gaza, for example, had been engulfed by what Benvenisti called the "Israeli super-economy", thereby dealing a crushing blow to the Palestinian economy and turning the occupied territories into a profitable market for Israeli products, which was also being exploited by the occupation authorities to sustain the Israeli treasury. Many observers, including Zionists, agreed that that policy was undermining the Palestinian community, depleting the resources of the occupied territories, destroying the local economic infrastructure, making the territories completely dependent on Israel and forcing the farmers to seek jobs as workers in the towns, where they were paid the lowest wages and made to work in the most squalid conditions.

8. Israel, which officially called itself "the State of the Jewish people", treated the Arab population of Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories in accordance with its ideology, which was based on the superiority of the Jewish race, and which was similar to that of the apartheid régime of South Africa. Indeed, the policy of "discrimination" which was the basis of apartheid was very clearly reflected in the Israeli practices in the occupied territories. The Arabs suffered from discrimination in respect of housing, employment, education and their basic rights. The legal system also discriminated against them. There were even parallels in the terminology used in Israel and in South Africa. Indeed, a South

(Mr. Shekar, United Arab Emirates)

African "township" was equivalent to a "refugee camp" in the occupied territories, and the term "removal" was equivalent to "deportation". The common terminology was also found in the statements, announcements and decisions of the Israeli and South African Governments, which contained a constant flow of words referring to discrimination and oppression.

9. Collective expulsion was one of the worst Israeli practices. It was based on a deliberate, declared policy. In an address to Parliament Meir Cohen had reportedly said that Israel had committed a serious mistake by failing to expel 200,000 to 300,000 Arabs from the West Bank in 1967. There were other examples illustrating the deliberate nature of that policy. In fact, past leaders, from Herzl to Ben-Gurion had repeatedly asserted that there was nothing morally wrong with the expulsion of the Palestinian people from its homeland, an idea which had more recently been expounded by General Gazet, the former Chief of Military Intelligence and current President of the Ben-Gurion University, as well as other contemporary leaders and scholars. Preparations for the expulsion of the Palestinian people were taking the form of savage practices, including Zionist terrorism directed against Palestinian institutions. Moreover, the institutions of the Zionist State practised official terrorism in the form of curfews, collective punishment, the demolition of houses, detention, interrogation, torture, the confiscation of land and property and deportation, not to mention the acts perpetrated by gangs of settlers such as assassinations, the destruction of cars, the poisoning of drinking-water and the desecration of holy places. According to a report published in the Israeli press in early 1983, one officer had admitted that he had been ordered by the Chief of Staff to torture Arabs, to make Muslim and Christian civilians crawl on their hands and knees and bark like dogs and to make children beat their parents.

10. On the previous day, the representative of Israel had jubilantly announced to the Committee that there was no need for elections in the West Bank and in Gaza, because the Arabs did not recognize those areas as being part of Israel. It was indeed true that neither the Arabs nor the international community recognized that Israel or any other country had the right to annex territory by force. However, the basic problem was the presence of 1.5 million Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza under Israeli occupation, forcibly deprived of their right to elect their representatives. It was for that reason that Israel would not allow free elections to be held in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip under the supervision of the United Nations. Indeed, Israel knew very well that if such elections were held, their outcome would be the same as it had been in 1976, when representatives supporting the PLO had been elected - to be subsequently dismissed by Israel - especially since a survey conducted in the occupied territories had revealed that 85 per cent of the Palestinian population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip supported the PLO. Aryeh Shalev, the former military Governor of the West Bank had therefore recommended that those territories should not even be granted autonomy.

11. The same situation prevailed in the Golan Heights, where Israel had already expelled more than 90 per cent of the population. In 1981, the Israeli parliament had adopted a law providing for the annexation of the Golan to Israel, and all attempts to protest against the situation had been brutally repressed.

(Mr. Shekar, United Arab Emirates)

12. The delegation of the United Arab Emirates was firmly convinced of the justness of the cause of the Palestinian people and reaffirmed its full support for its right to self-determination and to establish a free and independent State. The international community must adopt speedy measures to put an end to Israel's illegal and inhuman practices, and force it to comply with the will of the international community, international law and the resolutions of the United Nations. That could be achieved only if Israel withdrew unconditionally from all the occupied Arab territories and if the Palestinian people was granted its inalienable national rights.

13. Mrs. NAVCHAA (Mongolia) said that her delegation was deeply concerned by the worsening situation of the population in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories brought about by the continued grave violations of human rights there. The report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) proved that Israel was stubbornly continuing its annexation policy by creating and extending its settlements in the occupied territories in flagrant contravention of the fourth Geneva Convention.

14. Her delegation reiterated its vigorous condemnation of the unlawful activities of the occupation forces aimed at changing the demographic composition and legal status of the indigenous population, even in the city of Jerusalem. It expressed its full solidarity with the Palestinian people's struggle for self-determination and an independent State. As long as those goals were not attained, there could be no real peace in the Middle East. If a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East was to be achieved, Israel must withdraw from all occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and a United Nations international conference on the Middle East must be convened with the participation of all parties concerned, including the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

15. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/SPC/41/680) had been completed despite the unco-operative attitude of the occupation forces. His delegation regretted that, owing to budgetary constraints, the Committee had not been able to interview certain witnesses in Damascus and Cairo or have all parts of the report translated into all the official languages of the United Nations.

16. The report proved incontestably that the Zionist régime, far from "freezing" the creation of new settlements as had been claimed in certain quarters, was relentlessly pursuing its settlement policy, the aim being to consecrate the "Jewishness" of the occupied territories in preparation for their ultimate incorporation in so-called "Eretz Yisrael". Unlike the Syrian Golan Heights, whose annexation had been the subject of a declaration, which had, moreover, been declared null and void by the Security Council and the General Assembly, the other occupied territories were not even deemed to require such a formality. The Zionist leaders assumed that the territories which they had settled were an integral part of what they called their "historic land" and had said that the policy of settling in Eretz Yisrael would be pursued. The régime in Tel Aviv was thus laying claim to

(Mr. Baali, Algeria)

the territories occupied in 1967, in disregard of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which stated that military occupation must be considered a temporary situation that in no way gave the occupying Power the right to trample underfoot the territorial integrity of the occupied territory.

17. In addition to the annexation policy, the Zionist leaders were planning to settle Jews in the West Bank, and they were persecuting the Palestinian population there to hasten its departure from the land of its forbears, forcing it into the ever-growing UNRWA camps. A recent Ford Foundation study had shown 52,000 Jews living in the West Bank in October 1985, 21.5 per cent more than in 1984. At that rate, 100,000 settlers would be living there in 1990. In a recent survey, 38 per cent of the Israelis questioned had favoured obtaining the departure of Arabs from "Judea and Samaria", and 45 per cent had wished an increase in the number of Jewish settlements in the West Bank in spite of the economic situation.

18. The "annexation" of the Golan Heights and the declaration proclaiming Jerusalem to be the eternal capital of Israel were the latest stage in the process of annexing the occupied Arab territories definitively.

19. The brutal repression carried out under the "iron fist" policy of the occupation forces could not be justified by so-called "security" needs, but was purely political, the aim being to terrorize the civilian population and force it to leave.

20. The acts of institutionalized violence carried out by the occupation forces were compounded by the terrorist methods used by the Zionist settlers in the occupied territories. Such terrorist groups enjoyed the protection of the authorities and conducted with impunity a policy of provocation and violence against the defenceless civilian population. In such a climate of terror, hatred and insecurity, basic human rights could not be respected. Consideration of the repeated violations of human rights and freedoms, however, should not divert attention from the core of the problem: the denial of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and the occupation of their land.

21. The situation in the Middle East had never been as alarming as at the present time. The Zionist régime, through its irredentist attitude, its policy of oppression and aggression, its use of terrorist methods, and its occupation of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, was creating further insecurity and instability in the region. That situation could not last long. The United Nations, which had a historic responsibility for the origin of the tragedy of the Palestinian people, must take steps to bring about the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied territories and enable the Palestinian people to exercise fully its inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination and to establish its own sovereign and independent State. That was the only way to re-establish peace and justice in the region and it was the primary responsibility of the Security Council to carry out that task.

22. Mr. IBÁÑEZ (Cuba) said that, through its refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee, Israel sought to conceal from international public opinion its practices in the occupied territories in order to annex those territories and expand further in the region. The report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) provided sufficient reliable information demonstrating the further deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories. His delegation expressed concern and indignation at the systematic violation of the most basic human rights of the Palestinian people by the occupation forces through collective measures of punishment, indiscriminate arrests, torture, murder, expulsion and deportation, and the demolition and closing of houses.

23. The Israeli authorities spared no effort in obstructing attempts to bring about a peaceful and negotiated solution to the conflict. They had stepped up the construction of new settlements in the occupied territories and had invested large-scale material and financial resources to change the socio-economic, political and demographic structures in order to make their control of the territories irreversible. It was clear to all, even Israel's protector and ally, that all those practices in the occupied territories were flagrant violations of the fourth Geneva Convention.

24. Israel's expansionist and annexationist policies were the main obstacle to a negotiated settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict and posed a constant threat to peace and security in the region and in the entire world. Israel could not ignore international public opinion and flout the numerous United Nations resolutions without the economic, political, diplomatic and military support of the United States. The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Harare had condemned the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel and, in particular, the United States policy of providing assistance to Israel so that it could continue to occupy the Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

25. Both Israel and the United States must understand that there was no force capable of crushing the just struggle of a people to achieve its self-determination and independence. There could be no just and lasting solution to the problem under consideration without the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and the recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Cuba supported the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

26. Mr. Gonzalez (Chile) took the Chair.

27. Mr. IDRIS (Sudan) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) clearly illustrated the extent to which human rights in the occupied territories were being affected by the practices of the Zionist entity. Its violations included the continuation of its policy of annexation and settlement in the Palestinian territories, the expulsion of the indigenous population from many areas and the destruction of its villages, the denial of the indigenous population's

(Mr. Idris, Sudan)

right to return to its homes, the escalation of violence pursuant to the Israeli Government's so-called "iron fist" policy - including the adoption of extremely severe measures and the violation of the human rights of the Palestinian and other Arab population - a growing number of detentions and the arrest of many civilians, including young people, the resumption of the policy of expulsion and deportation on a larger scale, the imposition of restrictions on freedom of education through the arbitrary expulsion of teachers and lecturers and the prolonged closure of Arab universities, and the expulsion of duly elected Arab mayors. Such practices on the part of the Israeli authorities constituted flagrant violations of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and many other international instruments, as well as the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. In that context, it had been rather surprising to listen to the representative of Israel feign sympathy with oppressed Christians in other countries, while his own country was practising oppression every day and even endeavouring to liquidate the Palestinian Christians in Israeli jails and concentration camps.

28. There was not a single political prisoner in the Sudan, where all human rights were guaranteed by the courts and the law. The Sudan strongly condemned the violations of human rights to which Zionist Israel was subjecting the Arab population of the occupied territories. Moreover, his delegation was deeply concerned about the denial of the Arab population's right to return to its homes, the escalation of violence against it and the conditions imposed upon it by the occupation authorities and the Zionist Israeli settlers. Such practices reflected the racist and terrorist ideology underlying the State of Israel, which relied upon the seizure of territory by force, in total disregard of any laws and principles of justice. Ever since its establishment, the State of Israel had pursued a policy based on aggression and constant war with the Arab countries. It had used terrorism as a normal political means of instilling fear into the civilian Arab population, and was continuing to attract Zionists from abroad, notably by stimulating immigration through immoral media campaigns against other countries.

29. His delegation considered that the Israeli violations of the human rights of the Arab population of the occupied territories could be stopped only if the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people were recognized, including its right to self-determination and to establish an independent State in Palestine under the leadership of the PLO, following a complete Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, on the basis of a peaceful settlement to be worked out at an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all the parties concerned, including in particular, the Palestine Liberation Organization, which was the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

30. Mr. SCHEVCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) irrefutably demonstrated that Israel was continuing its annexationist policy and its violations of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. In implementing its policy of State terrorism, the Israeli Government was resorting to the most insidious and cruel

(Mr. Schevchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

methods to achieve its expansionist goals. His delegation shared the concern of the Special Committee at the escalation of the violence caused by the implementation by the Government of Israel of a revived "iron fist" policy. Israel's policies aimed at the annexation of the occupied territories were in flagrant violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Its colonial subjugation of the occupied territories was being carried out through the uncontrolled exploitation of their natural resources, the economic plundering of the local population, and a stepped-up campaign of occupation and terror. Those actions were contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and numerous United Nations decisions and further aggravated tension in the Middle East by creating an explosive situation which threatened international peace and security.

31. His delegation firmly condemned Israel's policy of annexation and expansion in the occupied Arab territories and did not recognize any changes in the physical character, demographic composition or status of those territories, including East Jerusalem. The Ukrainian SSR fully supported the appeals by the General Assembly to the Security Council to take measures to halt the policies and practices of Israel in the occupied Arab territories, inter alia, through the imposition of sanctions against that country.

32. It was obvious to all that Israel could not so blatantly flout the generally accepted norms of international law without the all-round support of the United States. His delegation therefore shared the opinion that the United States also bore the responsibility for Israel's actions in the occupied Arab territories. The Ukrainian SSR viewed positively the work of the Special Committee, which made a significant contribution to the struggle of the Palestinian people. It was necessary to bring about a speedy settlement in the Middle East in order to put an end to the suffering of the Arab population in the occupied territories and ensure peace and security for all States and peoples in the region. Only a settlement based on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories and the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to establish an independent State, could bring lasting peace to the Middle East. The proposals made by the Soviet Union set forth concrete ways to solve that problem. An International Peace Conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, was a practical way for achieving such a settlement.

33. Mr. DAMIAN (Romania) said that the information provided in the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680), together with other documents submitted during the current debate, provided a sound basis for examining the situation in the occupied Arab territories. Developments in those territories showed that there was a continual worsening of the situation of the Palestinian people, which was denied its legitimate rights, including the right to return to its homeland. The report of the Special Committee confirmed the view that the cycle of violence would continue and that the situation in the occupied territories would remain explosive.

(Mr. Damian, Romania)

34. Increased efforts by the international community were required in order to improve the situation of the civilian population in the occupied territories. That was all the more urgent in view of the escalation of violence and the new restrictions imposed on freedom of movement, education and expression, the seizure of land, the establishment of new Israeli settlements and the other practices that were in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention. His delegation reaffirmed its support for the just cause of the Palestinian people and called for effective measures to protect the rights of the Palestinian population in the occupied Arab territories in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

35. It had become obvious that the continued occupation of the Arab territories was seriously impeding efforts to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict. A just and lasting solution must be brought about through negotiations with the participation of all parties concerned. In that regard, Romania supported the call for the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the occupied territories and the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination on the basis of the security and independence of all the countries in the region. His delegation supported the idea of convening an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, Israel and all the permanent members of the Security Council. In that regard, he stressed that preparations for such a Conference must begin with a dialogue between the parties concerned in order to reach agreement on the organization of the Conference and its objectives. Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization must enter into a dialogue within the framework of the United Nations. A lasting and just solution to the problem in the Middle East must be based on the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people, the establishment of an independent Palestinian State and guarantees for the independence of all States in the region.

36. Mr. PAPACIU (Albania) said that Israel's policy of genocide and persistent denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people was proven by facts. Their Zionist policy of colonizing Arab territories had always been intended to change the Arab character of the regions concerned, and included attacks on Arab culture, works of art and the Arabic language. Over 60 per cent of the land of the occupied territories had been taken over, forcing hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to flee the lands of their fathers and seek refuge abroad. Thousands of them were in prisons and concentration camps, where they were subjected to unbearable and systematic terror. The tragic events in Lebanon, and particularly the massacres in the Palestinian camps at Sabra and Shatila, were a badge of shame for the Israeli Zionists and their anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian policy. All the evidence pointed to their intention of wiping out the Palestinian people's culture and national and historical heritage so as to create a void in the occupied territories to make room for Jewish settlers from the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

37. The criminal policy of the Israeli Zionists, who wanted to make the annexation and Judaization of Palestine into a fait accompli, had deeply offended not only the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, but also international progressive opinion and all freedom-loving peoples.

(Mr. Papaciu, Albania)

38. The Albanian Government had consistently condemned Israel's expansionist policy in the Middle East and its policy of genocide in the occupied Arab territories. It called for an end to Israeli aggression and expansion, for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and for self-determination for the Palestinian people.

39. The intolerable situation in the occupied territories was aggravated by the aggressive policy of the imperialist powers and especially the two super-Powers, which had tried to create a constant atmosphere of tension and instability in the Middle East so that they might impose their will on Arab countries and peoples and to dominate that rich and strategic area. Israel, with the help of the United States of America, had been turned into a military base and a bridgehead against the Arab countries and peoples. That was why the American imperialists had supported the aggression against Lebanon, which was intended to make that country an anti-Arab base, at the service of American hegemonist policies in the Mediterranean.

40. Israel was also aided and abetted by the policy of the Soviet social-imperialists, who were trying to acquire strongholds in the area. Although they pretended to criticize American and Israeli policy in the Middle East, they were hatching plots against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. They had allowed thousands of Jews to emigrate to Israel. Soviet policy in the Middle East was designed not to support the Arab peoples, but to pave the way for the political, military and economic expansion of the Soviet Union.

41. Putting an end to Zionist practices in the occupied Arab territories was an urgent necessity which could not be realized until the Israelis withdrew, leaving the Palestinian people free to determine its own future. It and the other Arab peoples should therefore unite and continue their fierce and uncompromising struggle, which was the only sure way not only to topple their Israeli aggressors, but also to bring to an end the interference of the super-Powers. He was optimistic about the Palestinian people's future victory, which had the support of all freedom- and peace-loving peoples.

42. Mr. ALSHAWKANI (Yemen) said that, although the Special Committee had been investigating Israeli practices for more than 17 years, Israel continued to implement policies with a view to annexing the occupied territories and expelling the indigenous population from them. The report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) provided numerous examples of Israel's deliberate violations of international laws and covenants, the gravest of which lay in Israel's settlement policy, which threatened Islam's third holiest city, Jerusalem. It was with the intention of implementing that policy that Israel had escalated its acts of violence against the population of the occupied territories in the form of "iron fist" measures.

43. The policy of State terrorism was inherent in Israel's political system. That fact was clearly demonstrated by the rise to power of leaders of Zionist terrorist gangs such as Begin, Shamir, Sharon and, perhaps in the future, Kahane. Its repeated attacks on Arab countries, including the raids on the Iraqi nuclear

(Mr. Alshawkani, Yemen)

reactor and Tunis and the continuous attacks against Lebanon, constituted a further dimension of that policy. Rather than comply with the will of the international community and implementing United Nations resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 40/161 E, Israel continued to concoct false arguments to justify such attacks. Those arguments, however, were unlikely to deceive others.

44. The violations of fundamental human rights detailed in the report were paralleled only by former Nazi and Fascist practices and the actions of the racist régime in Pretoria. Israel's refusal to respect the Geneva Conventions and to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions, together with the faith of the Palestinian people in the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, further highlighted the responsibility of States Members of the United Nations, and particularly of the permanent members of the Security Council, to put an end to the Israeli occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories and to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate right of self-determination, in order that justice, peace and security should prevail in the Middle East.

45. Mr. MAHMUD (Pakistan) said that the comprehensive report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) contained a horrifying account of the oppression, harassment and terror unleashed against innocent Palestinians and Arabs.

46. The measures instituted by the Israeli authorities were designed not only to change the demographic character of the occupied territories, but also to subvert and undermine the existing Arab social, cultural, political and educational structures. The common aim of such policies was purely and simply to annihilate the Palestinian people not only by force of arms, but also by resorting to such subterfuges. Israel's allegation that the report was biased could not be sustained, as it refused to co-operate with the Special Committee and continued to place obstacles in the way of its visits to the occupied territories simply because it did not wish the United Nations and the international community to have a first-hand account of the flagrant violation of international law and of the Geneva Conventions by the Israeli authorities.

47. He dismissed the efforts of the representative of Israel to prove that there had been considerable social and economic development in the territories as insignificant, for, even if they were true, human dignity, freedom and liberty could not be exchanged for consumer durables or bigger dwelling units. Indeed, it would appear from the Israeli representative's statement that life under Israeli incarceration was better than freedom.

48. If the Israeli authorities thought that they could enslave a people for ever, they were blinded by their own arrogance. No amount of repression, torture and terror, annexation or forcible expropriation of land could extinguish either the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people or bring durable peace to that inflamed region.

(Mr. Mahmud, Pakistan)

49. Pakistan had been consistent in its support for the international community's repeated calls for Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and upheld the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and statehood. It opposed and vigorously condemned the forcible occupation of territories, alien domination and the imposition of faits accomplis. He was confident that Palestine would emerge stronger from each ordeal. Israel must accept the justness of the cause of the Palestinian people and restrain its expansionist appetite and aggressive designs. Only thus could peace be restored to the tormented region.

50. Mr. Kouassi (Togo) resumed the Chair.

51. Mr. MANSÁ (Burkina Faso) said that it emerged clearly from the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) that Israel was doggedly pursuing its policy of annexation, aggression and repression against the peoples of the territories illegally occupied since 1967. There had been grave violations of the individual and collective rights of the peoples concerned in all spheres: political, economic, cultural and even racial. The Israeli occupation forces were thus putting into practice their "iron fist" policy, implementing coercive measures and thus crushing all hopes in the human rights situation in the territories concerned.

52. He condemned such practices as the harassment of civilians, restrictions on free movement, infringements of the freedom of teaching, arrests, expulsions, torture and cases of deportation of civilians, students and workers and the confiscation of arable land. The changes brought about in the legal status and demographic composition of the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories were proof of Israel's intention of annexing the territories outright. He regretted the ineffectiveness of all the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and attributed it to the arrogant policy of Israel, which, thanks to the collusion of powerful allies, continued to defy the international community. He also criticized the lack of solidarity within the international community, which impeded the effective implementation of decisions adopted on a democratic basis.

53. Only true solidarity between all the members of the international community could save mankind, because as long as flagrant injustice lasted, and as long as people sought to subjugate other peoples to their rule and caprices, the world would know no peace. The search for peace went hand in hand with strict implementation of the right of countries to independence, the right of peoples to freedom and the right of nations to an independent existence. Peace in the Middle East, and an end to the torment to which Israel was subjecting the peoples in the occupied territories would depend on the will of the international community to enforce the decisions of the United Nations on that question.

54. Burkina Faso, faithful to its principles of defending the rights of oppressed peoples everywhere, and armed with the experience it had acquired in its daily struggle for independence and dignity, reiterated its faith in their future victory, for history showed that a people could not be kept in subjugation for ever.

(Mr. Mansa, Burkina Faso)

55. That historical truth ought to be understood by Israel and its allies, which should know better than any other State that the key to the security and stability of that country did not lie in its military might but rather in a fair and comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East, which would enable all States to live together in harmony, within recognized and secure boundaries. His delegation supported the idea of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization. The realization of that aim would be an important step towards a final solution to the crisis.

56. Mr. AL-KHALIFA (Qatar) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680), as well as the statements by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization, supported as they were by reliable figures and eyewitness accounts, painted a black picture of the gross violations of human rights in the occupied territories. The report revealed a dangerous escalation in Israeli practices, culminating in the application of the "iron fist" policy, while information from Amnesty International referred to the persecution and arrest of members of trade unions and news from the occupied Golan Heights indicated that residents had been forced to adopt Israeli identity. Other practices which deserved particular condemnation included the policy of economic strangulation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which was designed to bring about the total economic subjugation of the local population, and the settlement policy, which was intended to lead to the final annexation of the occupied territories.

57. The disgraceful practices of an avowedly democratic State constituted flagrant violations of the basic rules of proper conduct between States, the principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. It was the responsibility of the international community to put an end to such practices and the particular responsibility of the Special Political Committee to publicize such violations of human rights through the resolutions it was to adopt. In conclusion, he wished to express the displeasure of his delegation over the manner in which the representative of the Zionist entity had referred to the Holy Koran, thereby insulting Muslims throughout the world, the Islamic Arab civilization and all those who believed in religious and spiritual values.

58. Mr. ANAM (Bangladesh) said that Israel had apparently come to believe the statement by one of its arch-enemies, Goebbels, that, if a lie was persistently repeated over a long period, it would eventually be perceived as truth. That was perhaps why Israeli leaders had chosen to live in a world of falsehood, erroneously believing themselves to be the masters of the occupied Arab territories and hoping that, in due course, world opinion would come to terms with the fait accompli. In response to the Israeli representative's query as to why Israel should be singled out for accusations every year, he proposed three answers: firstly, because Israel was annihilating innocent Arabs and Palestinians; secondly, because it was perpetrating serious infringements of fundamental human rights and freedoms on the people of the occupied territories; and, thirdly, because it was making a mockery of world opinion.

(Mr. Anam, Bangladesh)

59. He deplored Israel's refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee. His delegation was deeply disturbed by the information contained in the report of the Special Committee. On 6 February 1986, Israel's Permanent Representative to the United Nations had stated in a letter to the Chairman of the Special Committee that Israeli democracy afforded each interested person the opportunity to tour the territories and to see first hand the positive developments and improvements that had taken place under Israel's administration during the past 19 years. Was this not in contradiction with its refusal to allow the Special Committee to visit the occupied territories?

60. Although Israel spoke of democracy, its record in the occupied territories showed a total disregard for democratic practices. The report mentioned the dissolving of various municipal councils and other undemocratic practices which were the order of the day. His delegation was appalled at the grim picture of human sufferings painted in the report, in such spheres as agriculture, industry, education, health, the press, employment, religion, family life. He was highly sceptical regarding the "improvements" and "developments" that the Israeli authorities were carrying out in the occupied areas. Although the Israeli rulers did little development work for the Arab and Palestinian people, it did not hesitate to profit from the taxes, investment and labour of the people living in the occupied area. The overall picture drawn from the evidence and information examined by the Special Committee revealed a further deterioration in the situation of the civilian population.

61. In response to the remarks by the representative of Israel regarding anti-Israeli litanies reeled off in the international arena at the prompting of the Arab delegations, he noted that one of Israel's closest friends, speaking on behalf of the 12 countries members of the European Economic Community, had expressed strong concern at continuing reports of arbitrary acts by the Israeli occupation authorities.

62. He hoped that Israel would not ignore the repeated appeals by its friend to end that damaging and illegal policy in favour of the creation of the atmosphere of trust required for a dialogue leading to an overall negotiated settlement.

63. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) said that he reserved the right to reply at a later stage to the hypocritical accusations levelled against his country.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.