



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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

*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/42/SR.29
20 November 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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 (A/42/454, 455, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 650)

1 Mr. WIJewardane (Sri Lanka), Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, introduced the Special Committee's report covering the period from 10 September 1986 to 31 August 1987 (A/42/650). It was, as usual, based on oral information received through testimonies of persons with first-hand knowledge and experience of the situation in the territories, as well as material received from Governments, organizations and individuals concerned. The Special Committee had once again been denied by the Government of Israel the opportunity to visit the occupied territories but had endeavoured to use the best evidence available under the circumstances. It wished to acknowledge the co-operation received from the Governments of Egypt, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In its approach to the situation, the Special Committee had continued to use as a reference applicable international norms.

2. He drew attention to the Special Committee's conclusions (A/42/650, sect. V) which stated that the general policy of the Government of Israel had continued to be based on the principle that the territories occupied by Israel constituted an integral part of the State of Israel. That policy had led to various measures of settlement and annexation so that the climate of tension and violence had reached a climax during the period under consideration, which had coincided with the twentieth year of occupation. That atmosphere of confrontation and repression had left its negative impact on virtually all areas of civilian life in the occupied territories, affecting the population in the enjoyment of their civil and political rights as well as their economic, social and cultural rights.

3. In view of the financial situation of the United Nations, the Special Committee had endeavoured to prepare a rather concise report which still reflected accurately the plight of the civilian population of the occupied territories in all its dimensions.

4. In conclusion, he reiterated the Special Committee's hope that the international community would spare no effort in assuming its responsibilities and adopting measures for the effective protection of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the civilians in the occupied territories.

5. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) said that, at the beginning of November 1987, Israeli troops had opened fire on Palestinian students demonstrating against Israeli occupation, killing five and wounding more than 20. On 5 June 1967, Israeli forces had attacked the Arabs on three fronts, subsequently occupying Sinai, the Golan, Gaza and the West Bank, including Jerusalem. To some, the relation between those two events might not be obvious, particularly since they were separated in time by more than two decades. Some were unable to understand why Palestinian youths thus placed their lives in danger or how Israeli troops could open fire on men, women

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

and children, explaining the first case in terms of reckless zeal and the second in terms of unpremeditated error.

6. When the 1967 war and the recent deaths of students were placed in their proper context, however, and the organic relationship between the two made explicit, it was easier to understand the Middle East problem, to recall the basic objectives for which the Special Committee had been established and to grasp the full dimensions of the incidents mentioned in the Special Committee's report.

7. Although its mandate continued to be to investigate Israeli practices in an objective manner, the current report of the Special Committee (A/42/650) consisted for the most part of quotations from Israeli newspapers, which could not be regarded as impartial and reliable sources of information on occurrences in the occupied territories.

8. The aim of the 1967 blitzkrieg had been to drive out the Arab forces defending the areas in question, while the current illegal and inhuman Israeli policies had the goal of driving out their inhabitants with a view to annexing the territories to Israel. Therein lay the organic and causal relationship between the 1967 war and the practices to which the Palestinians in the occupied territories were subjected. One specific incident of humanitarian concern could be seen as a painful embodiment of a dangerous political situation with wide-ranging strategic dimensions.

9. Clearly, an understanding of the humanitarian aspect of the Palestinian problem could only be achieved through an understanding of its political dimension. The political dimension of the issue was centred, in the first instance, in Israel's goals in the region and, in the second, in the policies formulated by its leadership. It was the implementation of those policies that had come to be known in the present context as "Israeli practices", and those illegal and inhuman practices were the reflection of policies that were likewise illegal and inhuman.

10. It was within that framework that the report of the Special Committee should be assessed. His delegation would like to summarize the political dimensions of the Israeli practices in question in order to recall the true nature of the Palestine problem and of Israeli intentions towards the Palestinians and in order to make known the significance of Israeli policies with respect to the Palestine problem and the region in general.

11. There had been no change in Israeli policy towards the occupied Arab territories and their inhabitants. The territories continued to be subjected to an organized campaign of economic, administrative and security measures imposed with a view to facilitating their annexation. The inhabitants were forcibly expelled if they opposed the Israeli occupation; if they did not, they could remain in their country as mere refugees without political rights. In implementation of its annexation policy, Israel had interfered in all aspects of the lives of Arab citizens. The Palestinians lived in a semi-permanent state of siege and in continual confrontation with the apparatus of Israeli occupation. With the

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

so-called "iron fist" policy, Israel had taken all possible measures to destroy the means by which the Palestinians could survive. That policy was in contravention of all civilized norms of behaviour and was incompatible with the principles of international law relating to military occupation. It was therefore not surprising that the human rights situation in the occupied Arab territories had been deteriorating ever since the beginning of the Israeli occupation in 1967. All fundamental freedoms had been restricted, and their exercise might lead the Arab citizen to contravene the Israeli military regulations relating to freedom of movement, education, assembly, worship and expression. Palestinians could be safe from punishment and from encroachments on their fundamental freedoms only if they renounced such freedoms. For Israel, the Palestinians were an obstacle to the annexation of the occupied territories, and it therefore perceived them only in military and security terms and not as individuals endowed with human rights or as a people with national political rights.

12. Israel interfered with the educational system in the occupied territories and attempted to exploit the need of the Palestinians for education and culture in order to force them to accept the legitimacy of the occupation. Military Order 854 gave the individual the option of recognizing the occupation as a fait accompli or of forfeiting the right to education and to engage in teaching; the choice was between deprivation and ignorance or subjection and surrender.

13. Israel had interfered with school syllabuses, particularly those for Arab history and for geography, with the goal of obliterating the independent, Arab character of the Palestinians and in the belief that it could thereby eliminate the causes of Arab resistance to its aggression and occupation. To deprive individuals of their identity and culture was the most extreme and most abominable measure that could be taken in violation of human rights. Attempts to efface national identity had become the principal cause of legitimate acts of resistance, just as they were among the reasons for extremism and violence in the region as a whole.

14. Israel routinely closed universities and schools in the occupied territories for long periods of time. The occupation forces had entered universities, arrested students, broken into classrooms and confiscated teaching materials, thereby weakening the educational infrastructure of the territories. Such actions then led to situations of tension and violence which were used by Israel as a justification for even more repressive measures and more violations of human rights.

15. While the decision to issue the Special Committee's current report in abbreviated form might have realized some small economies in the United Nations budget, it had deprived members of the Special Political Committee of the opportunity to read the detailed evidence on Israeli practices in the occupied territories. It was to be hoped that the Secretary-General would reconsider that decision and that it would co-operate with the Special Committee in rectifying the detriment caused to its mandate and to the content of the report itself.

16. Freedom of worship had not been exempt from Israeli interference, and acts of desecration had been carried out by extremist Jewish groups with the connivance and encouragement of the authorities. Israel had prevented Muslims from praying in a

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

large part of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, while permitting Jewish extremists to perform their rites there. There had been repeated episodes in which Jewish extremists had intruded into Islamic holy places, and attempts had been made to destroy a number of the most important Islamic places of worship. Members of the Israeli Knesset had entered the Haram al-Sharif in order to pray there, which had led to clashes with Muslims and the entry of Israeli police into the precinct.

17. The Palestinians lived in a state of constant intimidation and humiliation. They had been attacked and insulted for no other reason than that they were Arabs. Such acts were carried out by the official Israeli authorities as well as by Jewish settlers who took the law into their own hands, as successive reports of the Special Committee had shown.

18. While it was sometimes said that Israel brought to justice and punished those of its citizens who carried out attacks against Palestinian Arabs, none should be deceived by the so-called rule of law in Israel. It was the Israeli authorities themselves which had initiated the intimidation practised by settlers and extremist Jewish groups, they colluded with it and it was an integral part of their designs to harass and intimidate the Arabs. There was an evident duality in the application of the law in Israel; all Palestinians were considered guilty until proved innocent, while Israeli terrorists were considered innocent even when found guilty of crimes against Arabs. Israel clearly used intimidation as a double-edged political tool in its foreign policy. It benefited from the terrorist acts of its citizens and then, by trying such terrorists in a purely formal manner, appeared to the outside world as if it was a democratic country where justice prevailed.

19. Israel's record showed that, in the occupied territories, it had violated most of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Since 1967, it had established more than 200 settlements and had confiscated more than one half of the total area of the West Bank. Even the Gaza Strip, where more than 700,000 Palestinians lived in an area of no more than 23 square miles, had not been safe from Israeli settlement plans. The objective of such illegal activity had been to destroy the demographic unity of the Palestinian people and its ties with the land in the occupied territories. The most serious aspect of Israeli settlement activity was that it represented a form of colonial conquest. The Israeli authorities and Zionist pressure groups in the West paid out enormous amounts of money to attract settlers from inside and outside the country and to induce them to live in the colonies established in the occupied territories. It was to be noted that most of the settlers were secular Jews whose motives for settling in the occupied territories were largely economic and political, which demonstrated the falsity of the Talmudic claim that the Jews had a right to settle in Palestine.

20. The activities of Israeli companies engaged in the sale of land in the occupied territories could be most clearly seen in the United States, where they published advertisements and conducted intensive campaigns in order to sell property to American financiers of Jewish origin. Full details of one such operation had been published in The Washington Post on 18 April 1983. Israel sold land in the occupied Arab territories at public auction for political, economic and

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

strategic reasons and then resorted to specious arguments of a religious nature in order to justify such activities.

21. Such illegal Israeli practices were complemented by policies of economic strangulation. Members of the Committee would no doubt hear the representative of Israel speak of the economic revival of the occupied territories and their development by Israel, and they should exercise their own judgement in the matter.

22. Israel's policies of oppression in the occupied territories gave rise to hatred, violence and rejection. It then used that situation to bring condemnation on the local population and to justify its occupation of their land. It had created the conditions for resistance and then oppressed the Palestinians because of that resistance. The situation in the occupied territories had been created by Israel in order to promote its expansionist goals; it then attempted to make use of a situation it had itself created in order to justify those same goals. It sought to make of the Palestinians both victims and culprits at one and the same time.

23. The world could no longer accept the current situation. The United Nations was fully aware of Israel's practices and of its designs and goals, and it had recognized the racist nature of zionism. That might represent the beginning of a new approach to addressing the Palestinian problem both by the United Nations and by Israel itself.

24. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the conclusions of the Special Committee's report (A/42/650, paras. 200-217) showed that the policy of Israel, the occupying Power, continued to be that of de facto annexation of the occupied Palestinian territories. That policy was a flagrant violation of Israel's obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention. As described in the report, Israel had utilized an elaborate illegal system of intensified repression to accomplish its objectives. Since the adoption of the report in September 1987, the occupied territories had been experiencing a massive uprising, in which dozens of Palestinians had been killed or injured and hundreds detained.

25. The General Assembly had repeatedly deplored Israel's continued refusal to allow the Special Committee access to the occupied Palestinian territories and had condemned its refusal to permit persons from the occupied territories to appear as witnesses before the Special Committee. The continued refusal was further proof that the Zionist authorities did not want eyewitnesses of their criminal actions.

26. During the 20 years of Israeli occupation, the territories had been transformed into a huge concentration camp. On 25 February 1987, the Israeli newspaper Koteret Rashit had reported that there had been half a million detentions and arrests of Palestinians on "security" grounds since 1967. On an average, about 5,000 Palestinians were in prison at any given time. As noted in recent reports of Amnesty International, torture of detainees and prisoners in Israeli prisons was common practice.

27. Amnesty International's report for the year 1987 had referred to the killing of the two Palestinians who had hijacked a bus; Israeli Attorney-General had said

(Mr. Mansour, Observer, PLO)

that the report of the last investigation had stated that the members of the General Security Service (GSS) implicated had earlier received pre-indictment presidential pardons. On 30 October 1987, an Israeli judicial commission of inquiry had found that GSS had systematically committed perjury over the last 16 years in order to convict Palestinian suspects. Many Palestinian prisoners had been murdered as a result of torture, brutality and medical neglect by their Israeli gaolers, hundreds suffered from chronic medical problems aggravated by medical negligence and inhumane treatment, and thousands were suffering from the general bad conditions and severe overcrowding in prisons, where the average space per person was only 1.5 square metres in Gaza and Hebron and 1.6 square metres in Ramallah. There had therefore been many hunger strikes in prisons during the year.

28. Collective punishment by imposing extensive curfews and mass arrests was turning the territories into a massive Israeli prison for Palestinians. Israel had been waging an intensive campaign to destroy the political, economic and social infrastructure and the will of the Palestinian people living under occupation. Repressive activities by Israel against institutions of higher education had increased dramatically. Students had been killed and wounded and universities closed for extensive periods.

29. The occupying Power had been insisting that the economy of the occupied Palestinian territories had been progressing steadily since 1967 and that the quality of life had improved under occupation. However, the text of a petition addressed to the United States Secretary of State during his last visit to the area, which had been endorsed by thousands of local Palestinian leaders and organizations, had declared that occupation and improvement of the quality of life were two conflicting issues; for one to survive, the other must vanish. The West Bank Data Bank Project 1987 Report, published by Meron Benvenisti, ex-Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem in August 1987, said that the balance of agricultural trade with Israel since 1982 had remained negative, with agricultural exports as a percentage of total exports decreasing from 49 per cent in 1968 to 29 per cent in 1985 and the Gaza Strip changing from a net exporter of agricultural produce to a net importer. The report maintained that the reason why Palestinian farmers were still unable to compete with their Israeli counterparts was Israeli control over water, with 4.5 per cent going to the West Bank and 95.5 per cent to Israel. West Bank industry remained underdeveloped, small-scale and traditional. There was therefore a huge army of surplus Palestinian workers, who provided cheap labour for the Israeli market. The statistics quoted in the report proved that far from the occupied territories being a burden on Israeli taxpayers, Israeli public expenditure obtained substantial sums from Palestinian contributions.

30. Restrictions on the freedom of movement of Palestinian national leaders, trade-unionists and students were widespread.

31. Expropriations of Palestinian land, the building of new settlements, the enlarging of old ones and the subsequent rapid increase in the number of Zionist colonial settlers brought with them an intensification of settler terrorism against the Palestinian people. Another report by Meron Benvenisti, Confrontations and Attitudes, published in 1987, explained that all settlers belonged to the security

(Mr. Mansour, Observer, PLO)

forces and were an integral part of the Israeli army and had therefore become more audacious because they were not punished.

32. Israeli repression in the occupied Palestinian territories was escalating and entering a new phase. Official figures put the number of Palestinians killed during 1987 at 22, compared with 8 in 1986. The intensity of resistance by the Palestinian people had increased sevenfold during the period 1982-1987 over the period 1977-1982. The computerized Data Base for the occupied territories, a project which had cost \$8.5 million and had been operational since August 1987, might, according to Benvenisti, prove to be a milestone in the institutionalization of the ultimate police state in the territories.

33. The Data Base had released several reports about land and population in the territories since 1982, showing that Israel had seized over 52 per cent of the total area of the West Bank and 40 per cent of the Gaza Strip and that almost all Palestinian land that could be confiscated had been confiscated. To confiscate the remaining area would require the expulsion of about one and a half million Palestinians. The Israeli Deputy Defence Minister had proposed that Israel should resolve the Palestinian issue by expelling the Palestinian population from the occupied territories and that the Western countries had the moral and political responsibility to handle their transfer to Jordan. The number of Jewish settlers had increased about 14 per cent over the previous year and if that trend continued, they would number 100,000 by the end of the decade. Hundreds of millions of dollars were allocated by the Zionist Government and the Histadrut annually for building and developing Jewish settlements in the occupied territories, the number of which currently exceeded 250. Some of them were becoming small cities and most were fortresses or military outposts overlooking the surrounding areas.

34. As repression escalated, so did resistance by the Palestinian people. The ratio of military to spontaneous acts of resistance had been 1 to 11 between 1977 and 1984 and 1 to 18 in 1986. Although the overwhelming majority supported the nationalist stance of the PLO, the Palestinian population was also acting of its own accord. Local initiative, rather than externally controlled violence, was evident from the type of weapons used. The problem of the occupier was no longer limited to breaking up organized terrorist cells but had evolved into population control and the political implications demanded increased attention.

35. That escalation had been accompanied by Zionist leaders' attempts to side-step the PLO, to set the stage for an alternate quisling leadership to represent the Palestinians and to establish a condominium over the occupied Palestinian territories on the pretext of implementing a development plan. However, those attempts would not succeed, as the Palestinian people and the PLO were strongly united. The PLO would not share its representation with any party. The situation in the occupied Palestinian territories was at a point of surging popular revolution, which Israel could not contain or stop.

36. The donation by the United States of over \$50 billion to Israel since its creation constituted and confirmed its complicity in the crimes and acts of State terrorism committed against the Palestinian people. The United States constantly

(Mr. Mansour, Observer, PLO)

encouraged Israel's persistent disregard of international will, United Nations resolutions and international law. Both countries still rejected United Nations resolution 38/58 C and other subsequent resolutions, calling for the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the PLO.

37. The United Nations must assume its responsibility and adopt appropriate measures, in accordance with international law and the relevant conventions, to provide adequate safeguards for effectively protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of the Palestinian people living under Israeli military occupation. The international community unanimously believed that the struggle against alien domination and foreign occupation was lawful, and that the Palestinian people was exercising its legitimate right and discharging its duties. Under the leadership of the PLO, the Palestinian people would continue to struggle until it attained its inalienable right to return to Palestine, to exercise self-determination without external interference and to establish an independent Palestinian State on its national soil.

38. Mr. ABOUL-GHEIT (Egypt) said that the Israeli occupation of Arab territories had entered its twenty-first year without any indication that it would soon come to an end. The sincere efforts made by his country to ease the way for negotiations leading to a just, comprehensive and definitive settlement of the question of Palestine had yet to succeed.

39. His delegation deeply regretted the continued refusal of the occupation authorities to allow the members of the Special Committee to visit the occupied territories. Despite the attitude of the Israeli authorities, it had not been difficult for the Special Committee to prepare an unequivocal and irrefutable report and to assign responsibility for the actions carried out in the occupied territories.

40. A fact that had aroused both interest and appreciation was that a large number of those Palestinians who continued to reject the policies and practices of the occupation authorities were young people born under the yoke of occupation over the past 20 years. His delegation once again found it necessary to sound a note of warning to all sincere persons in Israel that time was running out and that bitterness and suffering were becoming entrenched. The firm stand taken by the young sent an unequivocal message to Israeli society to the effect that the will of the Palestinian people could not be broken and that steps must be taken to restore peace and stability to the areas in question and to permit all neighbouring peoples to live in tranquillity and security.

41. The current report of the Special Committee (A/42/650) once again called attention to the "iron fist" policy imposed by the Israeli authorities on all those who raised their voices against current conditions, and to the continuing policy of annexation and expropriation of Palestinian land begun by Israel in 1967. The report once again elucidated the difficulties encountered by educational institutions in the occupied territories and reviewed settlement policies. Despite the fact that the international community continued to reject such policies, which

(Mr. Aboul-Gheit, Egypt)

were in violation of international law and custom, more settlements had been established on Palestinian territory during the course of 1987 and many existing settlements had been expanded.

42. The report once again mentioned curfews, searches of homes, administrative detention, imprisonment and exile. The occupation authorities had not been content with such policies and the demolition or sealing of houses and the expulsion of their owners had continued as a punishment for resistance to the occupation.

43. The report also called attention to a serious development, namely the pumping of surface water from the occupied West Bank to Israel, and the threat that that posed to the future of Palestinian agriculture. Israel must refrain from any act adversely affecting the production process in the occupied territories. His country joined the entire international community in urging Israel to assist Palestinian farmers in exporting their produce, particularly to the countries of the European Economic Community. Economic conditions in the occupied territories had been difficult and economic development had been greatly undermined. The Arab labour force had come to depend on jobs in the Israeli economy, which had led to the creation of a cheap Palestinian labour force subject to the economic will of Israel.

44. Israel's economic policies, which were aimed at rendering the economy of the occupied territories totally subservient to Israel, required the determined opposition of all. Israel should adopt new economic policies aimed at encouraging Palestinian investment and increasing industrial and agricultural productivity. His delegation was confident that the implementation of the recommendations made in many of the studies prepared under United Nations auspices would bring about developments of great economic benefit to the areas in question.

45. Some in Israel had recently called for the collective expulsion of Palestinians from their lands out of fear of Arab population increase and as a preliminary to enabling more Israeli settlers and new immigrants to settle on their land. Such calls greatly jeopardized efforts for a just solution to the question of Palestine. His country was therefore certain that all of those sincerely seeking a just peace in Palestine, whether in Israel or outside, would oppose such ideas and ensure their defeat.

46. It was, however, necessary to speak of other areas which Israel had invaded and on which it had imposed its domination in recent years, namely the border areas of southern Lebanon. Israel had engaged in random bombardment of Lebanese villages, killing and wounding their inhabitants and inflicting serious damage. Damage to crops caused by phosphorous bombs had caused considerable losses to Lebanese landowners. Egypt condemned such actions and called upon Israel to put an immediate halt to them.

47. His country wished to reaffirm its well-established position with regard to the need to ensure respect for the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. It refused to

(Mr. Aboul-Gheit, Egypt)

recognize any change in the demographic or geographical character of the occupied territories and rejected any administrative measures taken by the occupation authorities with a view to their annexation.

48. Israel must engage in confidence-building measures with the Palestinian people. The way must be opened for negotiations to begin within the framework of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. That Conference must achieve a settlement ensuring the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people and the opportunity for all peoples and States in the Middle East to live in peace and security and in relations of good-neighbourliness.

49. Mr. ATTAR (Saudi Arabia) said that the function of the Special Committee was not to find out whether Israel was committing violations, but rather to investigate the degree to which it was doing so. The Israeli entity in Palestine was the outcome of basic violations of legal and ethical rules. It was only natural that a country which failed to comply with such norms would commit the grave violations referred to in the Special Committee's report (A/42/650). As the Israeli authorities had boycotted its investigations, the Special Committee had not had, and would never have, the opportunity to obtain all the facts. Moreover, the report included only a portion of what had been communicated to the Special Committee.

50. If the Israeli project to pump huge quantities of water to occupied Jerusalem and Jewish settlements was implemented, the water level would fall drastically in the wells in the Arab villages and towns in the area of the project. According to official estimates, 43 per cent of the 100 million cubic metres of water pumped annually from the West Bank was piped to Jewish settlements.

51. From the Palestinian point of view, the law of the jungle, that of racial discrimination in its most despicable form, prevailed in Israel. It should be witnessed by those who defended Zionist racism. Israel and South Africa were alone in boasting about having established themselves on the corpses of their native populations.

52. The United Nations had inferred that Israel was committing crimes against human rights. Israeli authorities, who claimed to have obtained their legitimacy from United Nations resolutions, refused to co-operate with the Special Committee, because they were aware that the acts which they were committing were in violation of every law and condemned by every jury. However, that should not prevent the Special Political Committee from issuing a verdict on Israeli practices, based on an objective study of the testimonies presented to the Special Committee. Zionism's laws against the Arabs were crimes for which the United Nations should impose punishment. It would be interesting to know what the reaction of the United States, France and Britain would have been had the crimes of the Israeli secret police taken place in those countries. In Israel, the perpetrators rose in the echelons of power.

(Mr. Attar, Saudi Arabia)

53. The Special Committee's report alone sufficed to challenge Israel's membership in the Organization. It would be useful to know whether its membership would be examined, or whether it would be protected by the defenders of its crimes until the Palestinian people exploded with rage and proceeded to settle their accounts. The United Nations should shoulder its share of responsibility for having been silent on that issue.

54. Mr. POULSEN (Denmark),* speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, said that, as a matter of principle, the Twelve attached the greatest importance to all matters affecting the rights of the population of the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. They followed developments in those territories with deep concern and had often expressed their commitment to respect for international law and human rights, which were of universal application, in the occupied territories. Any violation of those fundamental rights must be viewed seriously by the international community. It was not only the well-being of the population itself that was at stake. Progress towards a peaceful settlement in the Middle East was also affected by tensions and unrest throughout the area.

55. The Twelve had taken due note of the latest report of the Special Committee (A/42/650). They had also noted that, in spite of repeated requests by the Secretary-General, the Government of Israel continued to maintain its position with regard to the Special Committee. Therefore, the report, in spite of the Committee's effort to provide data which was as full and objective as possible, did not present a complete picture of the situation. Consequently, the Twelve had availed themselves of other sources of information and would also take note of the views expressed by Israel as well as by other delegations.

56. The Twelve were of the firm opinion that the provisions of the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War were applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Israel's persistent refusal to acknowledge that view could in no way be justified and was a matter of great concern to the Twelve.

57. The European Community had repeatedly rejected the Israeli practice and policy of settlements and other measures affecting the demographic structure of those territories. There could be no doubt that those practices were contrary to international law, including the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. All Member States were under the obligation to abide by that binding principle, which is enshrined in the Charter and referred to in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Twelve continued to be seriously concerned about that particular aspect of Israeli policy in the occupied

* This statement has been given full coverage in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during the meeting.

(Mr. Poulsen, Denmark)

territories. During the past year there had been a disturbing move towards the opening of new settlements, while at the same time the number of settlers in existing ones had continued to increase in a manner which had naturally led to friction with the local inhabitants, who had the right to oppose measures so clearly illegal under international law. The Twelve continued to be disturbed by reports of harassment and illegal acts committed by the settlers against the Palestinian population, such as the recent tragic event in Gaza, in spite of efforts made by the military authorities to curb them. Any increase in the number of settlements was bound to set back prospects for a comprehensive and lasting peace in the area. Establishing new settlements and enlarging existing ones were indeed the reverse of the kind of confidence-building measures which would contribute to a peaceful solution. The Community's position was clear. In a statement of 14 September 1987 the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Twelve had declared that every new and every existing settlement was a clear violation of international law. They had also repeated their call on Israel to put an end to that illegal policy.

58. The European Community was deeply concerned at the many reports that had reached it from different quarters on the climate of increasing tension and the serious deterioration of the situation in general in the occupied territories. Those reports had pointed out numerous arbitrary acts on the part of the Israeli occupying authorities, notably cases of arbitrary arrests or detention without charge or trial, town arrests, house arrests, deportations, demolition and the sealing of houses as well as restrictions on freedom of movement.

59. The Twelve had followed with particular attention the tragic events at Bir Zeit University in December 1986 and at Bethlehem University very recently, where the opening of fire by the Israeli security forces had resulted in the death and wounding of defenceless students. The Twelve saw again particular cause for concern in the methods used to control demonstrations by students and others, and the increasing frequency and duration of university closures as a form of collective punishment. They were also concerned about the disturbing reports on interrogation methods and about the unsatisfactory prison conditions which had led earlier in 1987 to a hunger strike by about 4,000 Palestinian prisoners, followed by a cycle of violent confrontations between Palestinians and the occupying Power. The Twelve naturally deplored all acts of violence in the occupied territories, from whatever quarter they came. However, they could not fail to note that the more or less chronic unrest was to a large extent due to spontaneous reactions arising from legitimate sentiments among the Palestinians, as well as to frustration and rancour within the context of a long-lasting occupation and to the policy of the "iron fist".

60. The Twelve wished to reiterate their position on the policy of imposing Israeli civil administration on the Arab occupied territories. A military occupation could only be regarded as a temporary situation and could not confer upon the occupying Power right of annexation or disposal, or of extending its law, jurisdiction or administration in the occupied area. Such an extension was tantamount to annexation which, as it was contrary to international law, the Twelve also considered to be invalid. The European Community viewed with particular

(Mr. Poulsen, Denmark)

concern the question of the status of Jerusalem, which was a holy city for three religions and of extreme importance to all the parties concerned. The Twelve would not accept any unilateral initiative designed to change its status. The freedom of access to the Holy Places for everyone must be guaranteed in any future agreement on Jerusalem.

61. The Twelve continued to condemn Israel's decision to extend Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration to occupied Syrian territory in the Golan Heights. Such an extension, tantamount to annexation, was contrary to international law and therefore invalid. That decision prejudiced the possibility of the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and further complicated the search for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East.

62. The Twelve had often recalled their commitment to respect human rights in the occupied territories. Lately, in their declaration concerning the Middle East, adopted by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Twelve on 13 July 1987, they had further agreed that the deterioration of the economic and social situation in those territories, as well as in the region as a whole, threatened to complicate the search for peace. They had also stated that, for that reason, the European Community would continue to contribute to economic and social development, although such assistance could not be a substitute for a political solution. Without prejudging future political solutions, the Twelve wished to see an improvement in the living conditions of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, particularly regarding their economic, social, cultural and administrative affairs. The European Community had since 1981 granted aid to the Palestinian population of the occupied territories and had decided at the end of 1986 to give them tariff-free access to the Community for all the manufactured products exported there as well as preferential access to the Community for some agricultural products. They hoped that the Palestinian population would be enabled to take full advantage of those arrangements, as agreed by the parties concerned.

63. The Twelve wished to reiterate that the serious and at times explosive situation in the occupied territories continued to inflict unacceptable suffering on the local population and posed an obstacle to the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence that could contribute to overall peace efforts. The European Community's views on key elements which must make up a solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute were well known and did not need to be repeated. Through its long-standing contacts with all parties to the conflict, the Community was closely following all efforts to bring about a lasting peace. Its firm commitment to respect for human rights and international law in the occupied territories - and indeed, everywhere - was but one expression of its ardent desire to see a just and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, which could be achieved only through negotiation. All parties should clearly and unambiguously accept two principles: the right to existence and security of all States in the area, including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that that implied.

64. Mr. JABBARAL HADDAWI (Iraq) requested that the statement of the representative of Denmark should be given full coverage in the summary record.

65. It was so decided.

66. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Saudi Arabia should bear in mind that that country had also been the victim of the Iranian terrorists who had murdered Israeli citizens in the Golan Heights and Galilee. Those Iranian terrorists, who had the impertinence to call themselves Hezbollah, or "the party of God", but were in fact the enemies of God, also co-operated with the Palestine Liberation Organization and Syria. It was therefore incomprehensible why Saudi Arabia provided financial and military support to the PLO, an ally of Iran.

67. Mr. SADATIAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on a point of order, requested the Chairman to ask the representative of the occupied Palestinian territories to confine his remarks to the agenda item under consideration.

68. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Israel to limit his statement to the item under consideration.

69. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that he had referred to Hezbollah because the Iranian terrorists had conducted terrorist activities against Israel and the territories under its administration. The same terrorists had been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of people in Makkah. The PLO, which co-operated with Hezbollah, was given financial and military support by Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia was the only Arab country which provided the PLO with more than \$400 million per year and had already supplied large quantities of weapons and military equipment to the PLO military wing.

70. Hypocrisy had its limits. Saudi Arabia should not forget the bloodshed caused by the Iranian terrorists in Makkah, where more than 400 persons had been killed. In fact, 275 of them had been Iranian pilgrims, most of them women. It was clear, therefore, that the Iranian terrorists did not care whether their actions led to the imposition of necessary security measures which resulted in the massacre of their own people. He invited the representative of Saudi Arabia to visit him in Israel and see what the real situation was in that country so that the following year he might speak differently.

71. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement made by the representative of Israel had showed that the truth was painful, especially to the ignorant and to aggressors. The representative of Israel knew that every word spoken by the representative of Saudi Arabia was the truth. Saudi Arabia fully supported the Palestine Liberation Organization and would continue to do so. The PLO had more legitimacy in the United Nations than Israel did. Saudi Arabia supported the PLO as part of the total Arab and Islamic commitment to the PLO, which was the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

72. Saudi Arabia, however, did not support terrorism. It was against Israeli terrorism in the occupied Arab territories. Furthermore, it did not need any invitation from the representative of Israel to visit that country. One day a representative of Saudi Arabia would go to Palestine in his own right as an Arab visiting an Arab land. Saudi Arabia had condemned what had happened in Makkah. Nevertheless, Israel should not use that situation to attempt to sow dissension in the Muslim world. Everyone knew the role played by Israel in fomenting the war in the Gulf today.

73. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that in his statement the representative of Jordan had not referred to the PLO. When the head of that terrorist organization had been flying from Kuwait to Amman to attend the recent Arab Summit Conference, he had been informed that he would be received by the Jordanian Minister of Construction. Upon learning that, Arafat had felt insulted and had ordered his airplane to return to Kuwait.

74. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Israel was introducing extraneous questions into the debate. His delegation did not want to prevent the representative of Israel from speaking, but felt that he should confine his remarks to the agenda item under consideration. Accordingly, he requested the Chairman to rule on his point of order in accordance with rule 113 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

75. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Israel to confine his remarks made in exercise of the right of reply to the statements made at that meeting.

76. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that, in discussing that agenda item, it was necessary to consider the overall situation in the region. Mr. Arafat was behind the terrorist activities carried out by PLO assassins, one of whom had attempted to murder King Hussein of Jordan in 1973. It was essential to consider the position of the States in the region which both supported terrorists and were their victims.

77. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that he agreed with the delegation of Jordan that the representative of the Zionist entity should limit his comments to the item under consideration. Furthermore, using a point of order in order to reply to a statement was itself out of order.

78. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that the behaviour by the representative of Israel has turned the meeting into a bazaar. He therefore moved that the meeting should be adjourned in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

79. The CHAIRMAN, in accordance with rule 118, invited the members of the Committee to vote by show of hands on the motion to adjourn the meeting.

80. The motion was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.