



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOUASSI (Togo)

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.

A&P

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 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; A/SPC/41/L.20-27)

1. Mr. MAXIMOV (Bulgaria) commended the Special Committee for its efforts to fulfil its mandate despite of financial difficulties and the continuing refusal of the occupying Power to co-operate and allow members of the Committee to visit the territories in question. He reiterated his country's concern at the continuing deterioration of conditions in the occupied territories and expressed its continued solidarity with the Palestinian cause.

2. He said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) provided abundant evidence of continuing annexation and of violations of the human rights of the population of the occupied territories by the Israeli Government under its policy based on the premise that they constituted part of the State of Israel; Israel evidently did not consider itself bound by the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

3. One of the most disturbing practices was the ongoing construction of new settlements and the expansion of existing ones. Confirming the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, Bulgaria could only deplore such practices, which constituted a flagrant violation of international law and universal standards of justice and human dignity.

4. Recalling Security Council resolution 465 (1980), the provision of the fourth Geneva Convention which stipulated that military occupation was to be considered as a temporary, de facto situation and the reply of his Government to the Secretary-General's note addressed to Member States in accordance with paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 40/161 F, he stressed that the measures and actions taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status of the occupied territories violated international law and were "without legal effect".

5. He concurred with the view expressed in the report that the alleged "security" reasons presented as justification for the new wave of arbitrary and extra-judicial practices and other repressive measures were without foundation. He also agreed with the conclusion that there had been a further deterioration in the situation of the civilian population with regard to the enjoyment of their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. His delegation dissociated itself from any activities which could be used to further the policy of annexation and colonization of the occupied territories and did not recognize any of the changes made by Israel therein. His country had always supported the just struggle of the Arab peoples for a settlement of the Middle East problem, which could only be solved by the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the recognition of the Palestinians' inalienable rights to self-determination and statehood, enabling all the States in the region

(Mr. Maximov, Bulgaria)

to live in peace. He welcomed the convening of an International Peace Conference under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the most appropriate forum for seeking a realistic solution to the problem of the Middle East.

6. Mrs. DIAMATARIS (Cyprus) reaffirmed her country's solidarity with the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and its adherence to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. She condemned the policy of creating faits accomplis through the use of force and the violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of peoples throughout the world.

7. She deplored the deterioration in the situation with regard to human rights in the occupied territories as shown in the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680). The situation created by Israel's policy of annexation would not change unless it withdrew from all the territories occupied since 1967. Cyprus believed that a just and comprehensive solution - which could not be brought about unless account were taken of the legitimate aspirations and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people - must be sought as a matter of urgency.

8. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680) was essentially an indictment of the policies of Tel Aviv and its continued contempt and disregard for the human rights of the Palestinians living in the occupied territories. He rejected insinuations that the Committee wished to go through a yearly "ritual"; neither was it true that the resolutions were foregone conclusions before the debate even began. The issues continued to be relevant, and the international community was morally obliged to continue to speak out against the injustices perpetrated under Israel's expansionist policy.

9. He doubted that a resolution of the United Nations would ever move Israel to respect international law and norms of conduct. It was sure to denounce the findings of the Special Committee as a fabrication bent on libelling it; it would protest innocence and try to cloud the issue by claiming that anti-Semitic sentiments lay behind any criticism levelled against it. One would have expected the terrible experience of the Jewish people to have made them more sensitive to the rights of other peoples, especially the right to a homeland. The Palestinians had been reduced to a nation of wandering refugees, while their right to exist as a nation at all was denied. They must be enabled to exercise that right.

10. Instead, it was State policy that Jewish settlers were encouraged to encroach further onto Arab land, in violation of the Conventions of The Hague and Geneva. He also criticized Rabbi Kahane's extremist views on the expulsion of Arabs from the "boundaries of Israel". That religious leader's inflammatory remarks and violation of the sanctity of Arab holy places could only foment further animosity between Muslims and Jews. He also criticized the portrayal by Israel of the Palestine Liberation Organization as a terrorist organization and asked whether indiscriminate strafing of women and children in remote refugee camps was not terrorism. Had not the State of Israel itself been born out of acts of terrorism committed under the British Mandate?

11. Mr. YUSSOF (Brunei Darussalam) congratulated the Special Committee on completing its report despite difficulties and the lack of co-operation from Israel. His delegation condemned Tel Aviv's policy of annexation and settlement, as well as its "iron fist" policy, which had been illustrated since its implementation in 1984 by harsh treatments affecting the human rights of the Palestinian population of the occupied territories. He deplored the detention or imprisonment of Palestinians for political or security reasons; the record of the day-to-day life of the civilian population revealed serious infringements of fundamental rights and freedoms. As long as that situation prevailed, he saw no hope of improving the human rights situation in the area, and he urged the international community to continue to seek a solution which would put an end to the expansionist policy of Israel and bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. He also called attention to the political, military and economic support which Israel enjoyed and which had made it even more intransigent and led it to dismiss and ignore the reports of the Special Committee and defy the wishes of the international community.
12. Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) said that, according to the report contained in document A/41/680, the Zionists were still determined to carry out their expansionist plans aimed at driving the indigenous population away from the occupied Arab territories through repression and terrorism, with a view to the Judaization of those territories with immigrants from various parts of the world. In furtherance of their primary objective, namely the depopulation of the occupied territories, the Zionist occupation authorities were obstructing the functioning of the local municipal institutions in order to prevent them from providing basic services to the civilian population, from defending its rights, and from opposing their plans for depopulation and Judaization. The mayors of many municipalities had been subjected to various forms of repression, terrorism and deportation with a view to their replacement by subservient agents who would readily carry out Zionist plans and enforce Zionist laws.
13. Judaization had been intensified in occupied Jerusalem where settlements had been established, civilians had been killed, Arab buildings had been destroyed, social services institutions had been taken over and Islamic and Christian holy places had been desecrated. The occupation authorities were increasingly resorting to terrorism and repression. Moreover, as was indicated in the report, the Arab population of the occupied territories was also being harassed by the Jewish settlers. That situation clearly reflected the bestiality of the practices that the authorities were applying as a matter of established policy, and the statement which had been made by the representative of the Zionist entity about its "achievements" in the occupied Palestinian territories had been a pack of lies, which had failed to divert attention from the facts. Indeed, the Zionist entity had even refused to co-operate with the Special Committee and, significantly, had refused it permission to go and see its so-called "great achievements" in education, services, construction, civil engineering and communications, which, if anything, served the purposes of the settlers and the settlements set up on land seized from its Arab owners pursuant to the policy of annexation and settlement carried out by the occupation authorities. The truth about those Zionist achievements was exposed in the report. The report also exposed the deterioration

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

of education resulting from interference with curricula and the distribution of books on the part of the occupation authorities and from various other forms of pressure on educational institutions, the students and their teachers, including the imposition of military control over education and the rescission of Jordanian Education Act No. 16 of 1964, which had been superseded by Israeli law in flagrant violation of the fourth Geneva Convention. Paragraphs 54, 55 and 56 of the report were particularly indicative of other hardships confronting the local population.

14. The implementation of the "iron fist" policy had led to an increase in the number of arbitrary arrests and mock trials and in the number of people detained for long periods without trial, including very young people who were imprisoned on political or security charges, not to mention the imposition of fines and the resumption of the policy of expulsion and deportation on a large scale as reported in paragraphs 47 and 49. The entire Palestinian population of some major towns had been expelled to make way for Jews. In others, although most of the Arab population had been expelled and their property confiscated, the Arabs who remained were living in conditions similar to those confronting the African population in South Africa.

15. Mr. Shamir, on assuming his duties as Prime Minister of the Zionist entity, had stated that his Government would endeavour to accomplish more such "achievements", whereupon operations aimed at the destruction of the homes of the Arabs and the seizure of more of their land had been intensified in preparation for the establishment of 67 new Jewish settlements.

16. The Special Committee could only be thanked for the efforts which it had made to expose the situation in the occupied territories. Its arduous task would end only when the Palestinian people was granted its inalienable rights and allowed to establish an independent State in its national homeland.

17. Mr. MITAU (Kenya) said that the report of the Special Committee (A/41/680), produced under difficult conditions, gave a clear and complete picture of the hardships suffered by the population. There appeared to be no improvement in the human rights situation in the occupied territories, and civilians were still being subjected to various forms of harassment.

18. The international community must deal with Israel's systematic policy of annexation before it was too late. That policy had been confirmed from time to time by the Israeli authorities by the announcement of measures and programmes under way to establish Israeli settlements in what Israel called Judea, Samaria and Gaza. Citing the fourth Geneva Convention and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory through the use of force, he stressed that Israel should not be allowed to annex Arab territories for whatever reason and should observe and respect international conventions to which it was party. There was abundant evidence that Jewish settlers were encouraged by the Israeli Government, which provided them with all material aid as well as military and legal protection as they continued the illegal exploitation of whatever natural resources were available in the Arab occupied territories.

(Mr. Mitau, Kenya)

19. Every year the Committee continued to hear protestations from the delegation of Israel that the civilians in the occupied territories were living in better conditions than had been the case before the beginning of the occupation in 1967. Assertions regarding better housing facilities, roads, health care, telecommunications, public transportation and education were only aimed at blinding the Committee into condoning occupation.

20. Stressing the impartiality of the investigation team, his delegation urged Israel to allow it to visit the occupied territories so that the General Assembly could be informed whether the allegedly improved living conditions were for the settlers from Israel or for the indigenous Arabs. Israel's continued refusal to co-operate with the Special Committee suggested that inhuman and illegal practices were common. Emphasizing that a solution to the main question in that region was essential to a solution of the whole problem of peace in the Middle East, he regretted the fact that Israel, although ready to talk about peace, did not want to talk to the Palestine Liberation Organization. He therefore urged Israel to reconsider that pre-condition which constituted the major obstacle to Middle East peace talks. In the meantime, Israel should comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

21. Mr. EL-KHATIB (Morocco) said that the Israeli practices affected all aspects of the daily life of the Arab population. The Israeli military authorities were continuing their repression of anyone who opposed their measures for radically transforming the socio-economic structures of the occupied territories. Israel was also encouraging the creation of new settlements and the expansion of old ones in the occupied territories and continued to confiscate the land and property of the Arab community there.

22. A PLO report showed that the Israeli occupation authorities had a plan to annex and Judaize not only the Arab part of Jerusalem and the surrounding villages but also a number of refugee camps. The Jewish population in the West Bank had grown by 10,000 since 1985, reaching a total of 62,000, and, if the process continued, that figure would increase tenfold by the end of the decade.

23. A number of measures were also being taken limiting freedom of movement, freedom of expression and even the right to display sympathy for the Palestinians. Schools and universities were closed repeatedly, and Israel continued to desecrate Muslim holy places and pillage the archeological and cultural heritage of the occupied territories.

24. The measures taken by Israel to modify the geography, demographic composition and cultural life of the occupied territories were in violation of international law. The establishment of new Israeli settlements in the region violated the Charter of the United Nations and only aggravated the Middle East problem. A definitive solution was still predicated upon the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and the attainment by the Palestinian people of its right to return and its right to establish its own independent State.

25. Mr. SENE (Senegal) said that by deciding in 1947 to divide Palestine into a Palestinian Arab State and a Jewish State, the United Nations had recognized the Palestinian people's right to sovereignty. Since then, part of the Palestinian people had been condemned to live dispersed, and the situation had worsened in 1967 after the military occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. But no force could control the nationalism of a people determined to pursue its struggle for liberty and justice.
26. The United Nations must help the peoples of the region to find the roots of their historic fraternity and to transcend racial and religious prejudices. Throughout history, Jews, blacks and Arabs had known similar suffering. The Arabs and the blacks had liberated themselves from colonialism, but the problem of the Palestinian people, which had been deprived of its rights, still remained.
27. An attempt was currently being made to discredit the legitimate representative of the Palestinian resistance, the Palestine Liberation Organization, although that body had been recognized by 118 States.
28. The Middle East crisis was a threat to world peace. The United Nations must therefore help put an end to the use of violence, which only stirred up hatred and fueled extremist attitudes. A passive attitude on the part of the international community would only compromise efforts to defuse tension.
29. If the problem of human rights in the occupied Arab territories was to be solved, the Palestinian people must be able to exercise its right to return, its right to self-determination and its right to create its own State. The United Nations must convene an International Peace Conference on the Middle East as soon as possible to help all persons of good will to find a peaceful solution to the Middle East problem.
30. Mr. AL-SHANFARI (Oman) said that, although the Special Committee had been carrying out its work in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 1949 Geneva Conventions and other international instruments, Israel had consistently refused to co-operate with it and had prevented it from visiting the occupied territories. The Special Committee had therefore been forced to rely on other sources of information including accounts given by witnesses from the occupied territories and other interested parties in the area as well as the Israeli press. Consequently, his delegation was convinced that the report under consideration was unbiased and objective.
31. It was clear that the Israeli civilian and military authorities were carrying out plans and applying practices aimed at driving the Palestinian and Arab population to desperation and resignation in Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Syrian Golan Heights and in southern Lebanon, and at encouraging political extremism and hatred for the indigenous Arab population among the new Jewish settlers. Similarly, it was obvious that Israel's refusal to let the Special Committee visit the occupied territories had nothing to do with its alleged bias against Israel. It simply meant that Israel was not content with its ongoing defiance of the United Nations and its resolutions on the occupied Arab territories

(Mr. Al-Shanfari, Oman)

and that it was also unwilling to accept any international testimony on its practices, whose reprehensible nature it was well aware of. The new Israeli Prime Minister had resumed the settlement policy in the West Bank immediately after his election.

32. The report which had been submitted by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/41/13 and Add.1) indicated that Israel was endeavouring to liquidate the Palestinian refugee camps and do away with the word "refugee" because it symbolized the Palestinian cause and provided living evidence of the historical crime Israel had perpetrated against the Palestinian people. His delegation was deeply concerned about the deliberate two-pronged policy, which Israel was carrying out. First, it relied on methods such as collective punishment, the destruction of houses, administrative detention, economic oppression, torture, etc., to force the Palestinian people to choose between oppression and exile. Secondly, it confiscated agricultural land, houses, and water resources for the purpose of establishing hundreds of Jewish settlements, in an attempt to annex the remainder of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in the same way as it had annexed Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights.

33. The Government of Oman was endeavouring, to the best of its ability, to assist the population of the occupied territories through the Jordanian-Palestinian Joint Commission, which had sent a high-level delegation to Oman at the beginning of 1986 to discuss the critical conditions confronting the population of those territories. Oman was accordingly assisting the Government of Jordan, which had historical, social and geographic ties with the Palestinian people, in its efforts to provide support to the population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The policy of depopulation, which Israel was pursuing there clearly indicated that it had no intention of accepting a peaceful settlement, of recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, or of relinquishing the Arab territories occupied since 1967. On the contrary, it was establishing settlements and attracting Jewish immigrants who were allegedly to bring civilization and prosperity to those territories. Any attempt to oppose the occupation was regarded as a threat to Israel's security, and protesters were treated accordingly.

34. The situation was critical, and the international community must enforce the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on Israel with a view to the settlement of the question of the Middle East, especially the question of Palestine. In that connection, his delegation supported the idea of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all the parties concerned. Strong political will, especially on the part of the five permanent members of the Security Council, was of the essence if the Conference was to be successful in settling all the aspects of the question and in securing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of a political entity of its own choice in its homeland.

35. Mr. DOWEK (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had asked to speak in order to reply to the delegations of Syria, the Byelorussian SSR, China, the German Democratic Republic, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Bulgaria, Bangladesh, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Oman, Malaysia, Iraq, the United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Cuba, the Sudan, the Ukrainian SSR, Albania, Yemen, Pakistan and Qatar. That list showed more eloquently than any speech the reactionary forces with which, for over 50 years, Israel had had to battle in order to ensure its very survival. While presenting themselves as valiant defenders of human rights and world peace, such countries propagated an ideology and pursued actions aimed at the precise opposite. Although a number of them pompously called themselves "popular democracies", none of them knew what real democracy was. Virtually all those countries stifled domestic opposition with an iron hand, and each had instituted a one-party system that eliminated all possibility of free elections. Their leaders, in power over long years, had become monarchs for life and held absolute power. All those countries openly trampled underfoot the most basic human rights and cruelly oppressed their own citizens and sometimes even other nations. Some of those countries were in the vanguard of international terrorism, obscurantism and religious and ideological fanaticism. Champions of the double standard and guided by the principle that the ends justified the means, they perverted the very essence of coexistence and international co-operation.

36. In the World Human Rights Guide published in 1985 by The Economist, all those countries, with the exception of three, were rated between 20 and 30 on a scale of 100; by way of comparison, the country of apartheid, South Africa, had a rating of 22. Those countries that posed as the champions of the Palestinian Arabs in reality were using them cynically, prompting them to sacrifice their most vital interests in exchange for propagandistic resolutions, and the statements made by their representatives had aroused the profound indignation of the Israeli Delegation at such shameful lies, the total lack of objectivity and the scarcely veiled calls for the destruction of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. After five wars and 37 years of blind terrorism, there still remained the same intransigence, fanaticism and unrelenting will to destroy by any means a people and its State.

37. The story of David and Goliath was repeating itself. The Arab giant, with his vastly larger population, wealth, land area, and military strength, was hounding little David relentlessly and would stop at nothing short of total victory. David defended himself with the energy of despair and emerged victorious, because his survival was at stake. But more than victory, his most cherished goal was to put an end to the fighting and live in peace and real friendship with his giant neighbour.

38. Mr. Peres, the former Israeli Prime Minister, had recently stated that Israel alone could not solve the Palestinian problem but that the Palestinians alone could prevent a solution. Israel was convinced that only diplomatic means would prevail and not extreme positions and terrorism, which had brought tragedy to the Palestinians and sorrow to Israel and were the reason for Israel's own measures of self-defence. Mr. Peres had stressed that Israel opposed any form of violence or

(Mr. Dowek, Israel)

of annexation, that its enemy was not the Palestinian people but terrorism, that it remained firm in its willingness to talk with legitimate representatives of the Palestinians, and that it was the Palestinians who must choose between radical policies and violence on the one hand and moderate positions, willingness to compromise and peaceful dialogue on the other. Negotiations would be conducted without pre-conditions. But two issues were not negotiable - for Jordanians, Palestinians and Israelis alike: existence and self-respect. Mr. Peres had urged that the opportunity of the moment not be missed; to the Palestinians Israel said that coexistence was possible and peace attainable.

39. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel was indignant at what had been said during the debate because the truth hurt. The Israeli representative had spoken of the wealth of the Arab world. Israel obviously coveted that wealth and sought to occupy more territory through its expansionist policies. Lastly, the representative of Israel, in view of the terrorist activities which had been carried out by that country, should not accuse others of its own crimes.

40. Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it had been clear during the debate on the agenda item under consideration that the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee condemned the Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. By accusing other countries of undemocratic practices, religious fanaticism and terrorism, the Zionist representative attempted to divert attention from the real issues under discussion. The representative of Israel should not accuse other countries of the crimes which his own country carried out. An article written by an Israeli journalist and published in an Israeli newspaper in September 1985 testified to the fact that there was no democracy in the occupied territories and that the military authorities there exercised tyrannical rule over the Arab inhabitants.

41. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that if, as the Zionist representative had stated, Israel wanted peace, it would comply with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, which invited all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to participate in an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. It was clear to all, however, that Israel and the United States were the only obstacles to the convening of such a conference. If Israel wanted peace, it would not have carried out the recent air attack against a Palestine refugee camp in Lebanon. If it wanted peace it would not allow thugs and paramilitary groups to attack Palestinians in the occupied territories.

42. The Zionist representative had said that his Government was willing to negotiate peace with the real representatives of the Palestinian people. The Palestine Liberation Organization was the real representative of the Palestinian people and had been recognized as such by the League of Arab States, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the United Nations. According to a recent independent survey made with the assistance of an

(Mr. Mansour, Observer, PLO)

ex-Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem and a prestigious organization from the United States, 97 per cent of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories supported the PLO. The Israeli authorities refused to allow municipal elections in the occupied territories because they were afraid that pro-PLO candidates would win overwhelmingly. The lies spread by the Zionist representative could not conceal the truth about the real situation in the occupied territories, which even the friends of Israel recognized.

43. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the countries to which the Israeli representative had referred, were not, unlike Israel, occupying foreign territory, were not racist and did not conduct policies of aggression. The representative of Israel had invoked the myth of the Israeli David confronted by the Arab Goliath in order to justify its expansionist policies. The Arab countries had learned to be wary because the hand extended by Israel in a gesture of peace usually held a weapon.

44. Mr. PAPUCIU (Albania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was no surprise that the representative of Israel did not like to hear about his country's human rights violations and campaign of terror in the occupied territories. The Albanian delegation rejected the slanderous remarks made by the representative of Israel, which further strengthened its opposition to that country's annexationist and expansionist policies.

45. Mr. IBÁÑEZ FAJARDO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in spite of the fact that the international community had for years condemned Israel's policy of aggression and genocide, the representative of that country had the hypocrisy to level accusations at countries which supported the struggle for peace. Cuba was convinced that the overwhelming majority of mankind would put a stop to the Israeli policy of genocide in the occupied territories.

46. Mr. IDRIES (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was astonishing that Israel had never criticized his country when it had been led by a dictatorial régime. Now that the Sudan had a democratic Government, the representative of Israel had seen fit to make accusations against it. It was obvious why he would like to see a dictatorial régime re-established in the Sudan.

47. Mr. AL-SHANFARI (Oman), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his country earnestly supported efforts to restore peace in the Middle East. Although the representative of Israel had called for peace, it was widely known that that country possessed nuclear weapons and sought to become the strongest Power in the region in order to impose its will on neighbouring States. Force, however, would never overcome the truth. The Palestinian people would remain in Israel and achieve the implementation of their rights. If the Israeli Government wanted peace, it would participate in an International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations.

48. Mr. DOWEK (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, after listening attentively to the statements just made, he wished to reaffirm everything which he had asserted in his first statement, with the possible exception of the reference to Oman. According to the World Human Rights Guide, Iraq had been given a rating of 19 points out of 100 on the basis of its respect for human rights. South Africa had been given 22 points. The members of the Committee could draw the inevitable conclusion from those figures. Peace could not be established in an atmosphere filled with hatred for Israel. Although it was a small and weak country, Israel was determined to defend itself. It was categorically opposed to all terrorism. His Government would discuss the ways to achieve peace in the region with the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had no right to speak for the Palestinian people. In an interview given in November 1986, Yasser Arafat had stated that President Assad of Syria was using the Amal militias to attack the Palestinian refugee camps in Beirut, Sidon and Tyre in order to eliminate the PLO infrastructure and bring about the evacuation of half a million Palestinians from Lebanon. The Syrians were waging a shameful, dirty war against the Palestinians.

49. Miss MIAO Zaifang (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had criticized China's political system because he lacked basic knowledge about it.

50. Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, although the representative of the Zionist entity had accused other countries of human rights violations, it had not divulged its own rating in that regard and could not refute the information provided in the numerous reports submitted by the Special Committee. All the policies and practices of Israel in the occupied territories were violations of human rights. It was well-known that Israel had over the years repeatedly started war in the Middle East, the latest example being its invasion of Lebanon in 1982. The Zionist representative should not speak of terrorism since his country had introduced terrorism to the region through the Stern Gang, Irgun and other Zionist groups which had committed acts of terrorism against the British and the political leaders of the Palestinian people.

51. Mr. AL-SHANFARI (Oman), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to reaffirm his previous statement in spite of the fact that the Israeli representative might exclude Oman from the group of countries to which he had referred.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.