5

(1)

מדינת ישראל

משרדי הממשלה

נושא: פעולות שונות פעולות שלטון המאוחדות

7.70 - 5.70

מחלקה: נשיא כפשר

שם: ירושלים

תיק מס' 5456/1

משרד המשפטים - גליון רשומים

הנדון:

1) ...

10 9-6-70

(-) ...

9.6.70

2) ...

18 15.VII

... ראה

16/7/70

3) ...

23.7 22-23

...

28.7.70

4) ...

28 31.7

31/7/70

10

28

משרד החוץ

ירושלים, כ"ד תמוז תש"ל
28 ביולי 1970

מס' 388 (212.3.1)

אל : מר מ. שמגר, היועץ המשפטי לממשלה, משרד המשפטים

מאת: סגן מנהל המחלקה לארגונים בינלאומיים

23

הנדון: עדויות בפני הוועדה לשטחים של או"ם:
איסוף חומר להפרכת שקרים
בהמשך למכתבי 358 מ-23.1.70

בינתים הגיע אלינו ממקור אחר חומר להפרכת העדות שלסרוס (זוהי עדות מוחמד דרבאס, בפני קבוצת העבודה לשטחים ב-21.8.70 ובפני הוועדה לשטחים ב-22.4.70); אך החומר שבידינו אינו שלם.

כן אנו זקוקים לפרטים על העדות המופרכת שהזכרת, בדבר הוצאה-להורג כביכול.

בברכה,

צ. נאמן

27

ירושלים, כ"ד תמוז תש"ל
28 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: סגן מנהל מאו"מ א' - משרד החוץ

הנדון: עדויות בפני ועדה לשטחים
של או"מ: איסוף חומר להערכת
שקרים

מכתבך: מס' 358(212.3.1) מ-23 ביולי 70

1. בעקבות הפגישה שוחחתי עם המצ"ר והוא הסכים לכך, שמא"ל שפי יטפל בבדיקת החומר. הבנתי כי תבוא פנית רשמית למצ"ר ממשרד החוץ אך זו בוששה עד היום לבוא.

2. לשאלותיך -
א. המענה של סרום הועלתה ע"י מוחמד מחמוד דרבס והגני מצרף לופה את המסמכים בנדון. ...

ב. המענה בדבר חריגת אב"ד שרעי ועו"ד התייחסה לר"ר היידר אבו-חפי ולפאוזי אל חוסייני.

... לוסה משובה קמ"ט משפטים עזה בקשר לשני הנ"ל.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ירושלים, כ"ד תמוז תש"ל
28 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: סגן מנהל מאו"ם א' - משרד החוץ

הנדון: עדויות במגי הוועדה לשטחים
של או"ם: איסוף חומר להפרכת
שקרים

מכתבך: מס' 358(212.3.1) מ-23 ביולי 70

1. בעקבות הפגישה שוחחתי עם הפצ"ר והוא הסכים לכך, שסא"ל שפי יטפל בבדיקת החומר. הבנתי כי תבוא פניה רשמית לפצ"ר ממשרד החוץ אך זו בוששה עד היום לבוא.

2. לשאלותיך -
א. הטענה של סרום הועלתה ע"י מוחמד מחמוד דרבס ... והנני מצרף לוסה את המסמכים בנדון.

ב. הטענה בדבר הריגת אב"ד שרעי ועו"ד התייחסה לד"ר היידר אבו-שפי ולפאוזי אל חוסייני.

... לוסה תשובת קמ"מ משפטים עזה בקשר לשני הנ"ל.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ירושלים, כ"ד תמוז תש"ל
28 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: סגן מנהל מאו"מ א' - משרד החוץ

הנדון: עדויות בפני הוועדה לשטחים
של או"מ: איסוף חומר להטרכת
שקרים

מכתבך: מס' 358(212.3.1) מ-23 ביולי 70

1. בעקבות הפגישה שוחחתי עם הפצ"ר והוא הסכים לכך, שסא"ל שמי יספל בבדיקת החומר. הבנתי כי תבוא פניה רשמית לפצ"ר ממשרד החוץ אך זו בוששה עד היום לבוא.

2. לשאלותיך -
א. הטענה של סרוס הועלתה ע"י מוחמד מחמוד דרבס והגני מצרף לזה את המסמכים בנדון. ...

ב. הטענה בדבר הריגת אב"ד שרעי וער"ד החיליחסה לד"ר הילדר אבו-שמי ולמאוזי אל חוסייני.

... לזה תשובת קמ"ם משפטים עדה בקשר לשני הנ"ל.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

קמ"ט משפטים עזה

לכבוד
סר מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה
ירושלים

הנדון: בירורים
מכתבך: 1431 מיום 28.4.70

א. ד"ר היידר אבו-שפי - אב"ד השרעי

1. השם המדוייק ד"ר חיידר עבד אל-שאפי;
2. לא היה אף פעם אב"ד שרעי;
3. הנ"ל רופא במקצועו וידוע באיש לאומני;
4. לפני מלחמת ששת הימים היה ראש הסועצה המחוקקת וראש הקונגרס הלאומי הפלסטיני;
5. אחרי מלחמת ששת הימים היה בעל קליניקה פרטית;
6. לפני כ-8 חודשים נגלה למיני אך לא מכבר הוחזר מהגלייתו והיום הוא בעל מרפאה פרטית בעזה.

ב. עוד" בשם - מאוזי אל חוסייני

1. אין עו"ד בעזה בשם זה;
2. יש עו"ד בשם פיצל אל חוסייני שגם הוא נגלה עם ד"ר היידר והוחזר מהגלייתו, והיום הוא בעל משרד לעריכת דין בעזה; ידוע בנטיותיו הקומוניסטיות;
3. יש שמות דומים אחרים שאם אתה מעונין בפרטים אודותם, אשמח למסור לך; ואלה הם השמות פוזי על-ע'דין, פהמי אל-חוסניני, פוזי אל-דג'אני.

(-)
גור צבר
קמ"ט משפטים

25

ירושלים, כב' תמוז תש"ל
26 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: נציב בתי הסוהר

הנדון: סלאחט - פעצורי כראמה

האם היה עצור בשם הנ"ל בין עצורי כראמה והאם נכונה
הטענה כי לא היה מסוגל לעמוד על רגליו.
אם הטענה נכונה - מה היתה סיבת נכותו.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ירושלים, כב' תמוז תש"ל
26 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: נציב בתי הסוהר

הנדון: סלאחת - מעצורי כראמה

האם היה עצור בשם הנ"ל בין עצורי כראמה והאם נכונה
הטענה כי לא היה מסוגל לעמוד על רגליו.
אם הטענה נכונה - מה היתה סיבת נכותו.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

24

ירושלים, ב"ב בתמוז תש"ל
26 ביולי 1970

455421

אל: נציב בתי הטוהר, ירושלים

הנדון: שחה איברהים אל-כואלי (או
אל-קוקלי) - ג'נין

אודה לך אם תבדוק אם היה בידינו עציר או
אסיר בשם הנ"ל. בועדת האו"ם לזכויות האדם נטען,
כי הוא היה בן 14 בעת מעצרו. מקום מגוריו - ג'נין.

ב ב ר כ ה,

משיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי למשלה

203

משרד החוץ

ירושלים, י"ט אייר תש"ל
23 ביולי 1970

מס' 358 (212.3.1)

ש מ ו ר

אל : מר מ. שמגר, היועץ המשפטי למשלה, משרד המשפטים

מאת: סגן מנהל מאו"ם א'

הנדון: עדויות בפני הוועדה לשטחים של או"ם:
איסוף חומר להפרכת שקרים
מכתבך 45421 מיום 19.7.70

אני מודה לך על שעוררת את השאלה. בישיבה שהתקיימה במשרד החוץ לפני כחודשיים הוחלט כזכור להקים קבוצת עבודה לטיפול בעניין זה והסכמת להחליף דברים עם הפצ"ר לצורך "גיוס" איש לריכוז הפעולה. מנסיוננו אשתקד (בקשר לעדויות שבפני קבוצת-העבודה לשטחים) למדנו כי אפשר יהיה לטפל בהפרכה רק אם יתמסר לעניין איש המכיר בהווייתם ולגופם את נושאי העדויות השונות, דהיינו איש פצ"ר או איש מצ"ב.

יש בידינו חומר גלמי חשוב, שנאסף אשתקד ע"י ענף משל צבאי בקשר לכמה עדויות בפני קבוצת-העבודה לשטחים (והרי בדרך כלל אותם העדים חזרו והופיעו בפני הוועדה לשטחים); אבל החומר, המסווג כ"סודי", מעון עיבוד והשלמה לפני היותו בשיר לפרסום כלשהו. גם בחירת העדויות אשתקד היתה מקרית ולאור-רוקא הקולעת ביותר.

זכורני שבאותה ישיבה שלפני כחודשיים הזכרת שני מקרים של עדויות שופרכות (האחד בדבר טרום כביכול והשני בדבר הוצאת-להורג כביכול) והייתי מבקש לקבל ממך את שמות העדים ואת פרטי ההפרכה. אם יותר נוח לך, אשמח לבוא לצורך זה למשרדך.

הפרוטוקולים המלאים של העדויות (טרם פורסמו בפני הוועדה לשטחים) אבל מצויות ההודעות-לעתונות של או"ם ונוכל להתחיל להכין חומר הפרכה על סמך האמור בהן (ולהשלים יותר מאוחר, ע"פ הפרוטוקולים). המדובר כמובן בבחירת כמה עדויות (נאמר, בין 3 ל-5), מהצורמות ביותר בשקרנותן, ובהכנת ההפרכות בצורה מוסמכת ומשכנעת. הבעיה, כאמור, אינה אלא מינוי איש מתאים לריכוז המבצע.

בשלב יותר מאוחר ובהתאם לתוצאות, נדון בדרכי ניצול חומר ההפרכה למטרות הסברה. העיתוי יהיה בוודאי קשור בדיון עצרת או"ם בדו"ח הוועדה לשטחים.

ב ב ר כ ה,

צ. נאמן

העתק: מר מ. קומיי, היועץ המדיני
מר ת. מירון, היועץ המשפטי
סא"ל ר. דוידי, ראש ענף משל צבאי/מטכ"ל
נציגות ישראל באו"ם, ניו-יורק
תיק ועדה שלישית במחלקה

23.7.70

חקר

סגן מנהל כאו"ם א'

הנדון: חומר להתרכת עדות של ערבי בענני הוועדה לשטחים של או"ם

במסגרת איסוף חומר להוקעת שקרי עדים שהופיעו בענני הוועדה לשטחים של או"ם, נתקלנו במקרה הבא:

ב"דבר וב"ג'רוזלם פוסט" מיום 23.4.70 התפרסמה כתבה המפריכה בפרוטרוט את עדות מייסיר נאבולסי, רכז החינוך בג'נין לשעבר, על מעצרו ועינויו בביכול בידי שלטונות ישראל. מאידך, הוועדה-לעתונות של או"ם נזכרת עדותו של מייסיר נאבולסי, שנורש משכם ומטר לוועדה ממכים מוגים בשם אש"ף, אך בהודעה לעתונות אין שכר לטענות בדבר מעצר או עינויים.

התוכלו לטצוא בעתונות או בשידורים הערביים ידיעה על עדות זו המדברת במפורש על מעצרו ועינויו? העדות חיתה ברבת-עמון ביום 17.4.70.

לידיעתכם, הפרוטוקולים המלאים של העדויות בענני הוועדה לשטחים יתפרסמו בוודאי בעוד כמה שבועות; שכל אנחנו מעדיפים להקדים את בדיקותינו.

ב ב ר כ ה

צ. נאסן

העתק: מא"ל ר. דוידי, ראש ענף המטה הצבאי/ מפכ"ל
מר י. אלמוג, נציג המפרד בשטחים
מר ז. סומות, ס/מנהל החברה
לשכת היועץ המשפטי למשלה, משרד המשפטים

31

מס' 355 (212.3.1)

קצין העיתונות

ס/מנהל מאו"ם א'

הנדון: קרון הישראלי אבילאה בפני
הוועדה לשטחים בימים 12.6.70

... מצורף בזה העתק מכתב היועץ המשפטי
למשלה (מס' 45421 מ-15.7.70) המנמק את
הצעתו לפרסם את תוכן הערות הנ"ל בארץ.

... לנוחיותך אני מצרף בזה גם את העתק
הערות (כפי שהגישה בטחי הודעות לעתונות
של או"ם) ושמחה להיות לעזר אם יהיה צורך
בהן.

כזכור, מדבריו למתב "הארץ" (29.6.70)
גימה אבילאה לשוות לעדותו אופי ארכיאקטיבי
כביכול.

כ ב ו ד כ ה,

צ. נאמן

העתק: מר מ. המגר, היועץ המשפטי למשלה,
משרד המשפטים.
מר מ. קומיי, משרד החוץ
מר ש. דיבון, משרד החוץ
מר מ. מירון, משרד החוץ

20.7.70

משרד המשפטים
יש תמוז תש"ל = 23.7.70
45421

ירושלים, ט"ו תמוז תש"ל
19 ביולי 1970

43421

אל: משרד החוץ - מגן מנהל המחלקה לארגונים בינלאומיים

הנדון: <u>עדויות בפני הוועדה לשמחים של או"ם</u>
מכתבך: מס' 325 (212.3.1) מ-14 יולי 1970

מכתבך איננו מתיחס לשאלה אם יעשו מעולות לשם אמוף חומר שיש בו כדי להפריך שקרים שהושמעו בפני הועדה, כדי שחומר זה יוכל לשמש את גורמי ההסברה שלנו.

בברכה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ארכיב

נא לתיק קיים
המתאים בו
נמצא כל
החומר.

משרד החוץ

ירושלים, י' אייר תש"ל
14 יולי 1970

מס' 325 (212.3.1)

אל : מר מ. שמגר, היועץ המשפטי לממשלה, משרד המשפטים
סא"ל ר. דוידי, ראש ענף ממשל צבאי - מטכ"ל/אג"ם, צה"ל

מאת: סגן מנהל המחלקה לארגונים בינלאומיים

הנדון: עדויות בפני הוועדה לשטחים של או"ם

1. מצורף בזה צרור הודעות-לעתונות של או"ם, המוקרות את תוכן העדויות שנגבתה הוועדה המיוחדת לחקירת נוהגי ישראל בשטחים המוחזקים (הוועדה לשטחים) בין ראשית אפריל ואמצע יוני 1970, בלונדון, בירות, דמשק, רבת עמון, קהיר, ג'נבה וניו-יורק.

2. כן מצורפת בזה רשימת העדים, שנערכה אצלנו ע"פ ההודעות לעתונות הנ"ל. רשימתנו כוללת 126 עדים ואילו בהודעות או"ם מדובר על כ-150 עדים שהופיעו בפני הוועדה. יתכן שברשימתנו חסרים כמה עדים (בשני תריסרים) שהופיעו בדלתיים סגורות ושעדותם לא נזכרה בהודעות לעתונות.

3. בפני הוועדה הופיעו ישראלים בודדים (מחובר והיילברון בלונדון ב-2.4.70, וייגרט בג'נבה ב-1.5.70 ואבילאה בניו-יורק ב-12.6.70).

4. כידוע אין ישראל משתפת פעולה עם הוועדה לעמדתנו הוכחרה רשמית באגרות למזכ"ל או"ם. לאחרונה הגשנו למזכ"ל שלוש אגרות נפרדות המוקיעות את שלוש המדינות החברות בוועדה (סומליה, יוגוסלביה וציילון), שכל אחת מהן בילתה לאחרונה פומבית את איבתה לישראל והוכיחה בכך שהוועדה היא גוף משוחד ופסול.

5. הוועדה עוסקת עתה בהכנת הדו"ח שלה, שיושלם כנראה באוגוסט השנה. בהתאם להחלטת העצרת, תדווח הוועדה למזכ"ל או"ם ויש להניח כי המזכ"ל יגיש את הדו"ח למושב הקרוב של העצרת. לדו"ח הוועדה יצורפו בוודאי הפרוטוקולים המלאים והמוסמכים של העדויות (ההודעות לעתונות הר"ב אינן מסמכים רשמיים) וכן מסמכים אחרים שהוגשו לוועדה. צפויים בעצרת דיון והחלטת בינוי, שתתקבל בקולותיהם של הערבים, הסוביאטים ותומכיהם.

6. יש להבחין בין הוועדה לשטחים הנדונה לבין קבוצת-עבודה של "פושחים" שהוקמה ע"י הוועדה לזכויות האדם של או"ם לחקירת האשמות על הפרות אמנת ג'נבה הרביעית בשטחים המוחזקים (קבוצת העבודה לשטחים). קבוצת העבודה נבחה עדויות אשתקד והכינה לפני כחצי שנה דו"ח שהוגש לוועדה לזכויות האדם וגרר החלטת בינוי חריפה נגד ישראל.

משרד החוץ

אותו דו"ח, בצרוף הפרוטוקולים של העדויות שגבתה קבוצה-העבודה, הועבר אליכם בשעתו (באפריל 1970). גם עם קבוצה-העבודה אין ישראל משתפת פעולה.

7. למקבלי ההעתקים: נוכל להמציא את העתקי ההודעות לעתונות על העדויות למעוניינים בכך.

ב ב ר כ ה,

צ. נאמן

העתק: סא"ל ד. שפי, פרקליטות צבאית ראשית
מר צ. רפיח, לשכת שר המשטרה
לשכת מר מ. קומיי, היועץ המדיני
לשכת מר מ. ששון, מפנכ"ל
לשכת מר ת. מירון, היועץ המשפטי
תיק ועדה שלישית במחלקה

ירושלים, י"ז בתמוז תשל"
15 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: סגן מנהל המחלקה לתרגומים בינלאומיים, משרד החוץ

הנדון: עדות הישראלי המבילאה בפני הוועדה לשמחים
מכתבך: מס' 319(212.3.1) מיום 13 ביולי 1970

1. ההחלטה בנדון נמלה בודאי לאחר בדיקת הענין לכל גדדיו.

2. עם זאת, איננו יכול אלא להביע דעתי המולקת על דעתכם: המדובר הוא על פרסום בארץ אשר מגמתו לגלות לציבור הרחב המעמדת של חוגים המומיעים בציבוריות הישראלית כרודפי ברק ברידה, אשר רק המאמה הברוטה ושוחר מידות צבורנו - נר לרגליהם.

ויומני כי חוגים אלה ל א היו דובים הבך - כי מעגות המבזב שלהם בעני בפרטי הוך הוכמנה לידיעת הציבור בארץ.

3. שבומו של דבר: פרסום מסוג זה ל-"ליבה" לא יחיה בו כדי להעלות מעמדם בעיני הלמידים וחוגים אחרים המוטעים לדבריהם בארץ.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
מיועץ המשפטי לממשלה

העתק: מר ת. קומליי, משרד החוץ
מר ש. דיבון, משרד החוץ

ירושלים, י"ז בתמוז תש"ל
15 ביולי 1970

45421

אל: מבן מנהל המחלקה לארגונים בינלאומיים, משרד החוץ

הנדון: עדות הישראלי אבילאת בענין הנועדה לשמחים
המתבך: מס' 319(1.3.2.2) מיום 13 ביולי 1970

1. התשלום בנדון נעלת בודאי לאחר בדיקה מענין לכל צדדיו.

2. עם זאת, איננו יכול אלא להביע דעתי המולקת על דעתכם: המדובר הרי על ערסום בארץ אחר הנמצא לגלות לציבור מהימנה האמיתית של חוגים המוביעים בציבוריות הישראלית כרוזשי צדק גרידא, אחר רק האמת הערומה ושומר מידות צבורנו - גר לרבליהם.

דומני כי חוגים אלה ל א היו רוצים בכך - כי מעבות הכזב שלהם בחפצי בערמי חוץ תובאנה לידיעת הציבור בארץ.

3. סכומו של דבר: ערסום המוג זה ל-"ליבה" לא יהיה בו כדי להעלות מעמדם בעיני מלסידים וחוגים אחרים המוטלים לדבריהם בארץ.

ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שחגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

העתק: מר כ. קומיי, משרד החוץ
מר ש. ליבון, משרד החוץ

45421

משרד החוץ

ירושלים, ט' אייר תש"ל
13 יולי 1970

מס' 319 (212.3.1)

שמור

אל: מר מאיר שמגר, היועץ המשפטי לממשלה, משרד המשפטים

מאת: סגן מנהל המחלקה לארגונים בינלאומיים

הנדון: עדות הישראלי אבילאה בפני הוועדה לשטחים
מכתבך מיום 1.7.70

הבאתי בפני העוסקים אצלנו בעתונות את הצעתך להפיץ את עדות אבילאה לעתונות הישראלית (לשם הפרכת שקריו); אלא שלדעתם פרסום כזה בשלב זה שכרו ייצא בהפסדו: הוא יעניק פרסומת הן ל"ליגה" הישראלית והן לוועדה לשטחים ובסופו של דבר כל פרסומת – ואפילו שלילית – משרתת את הגופים הללו.

בברכה,

צ. נאמן

משרד המשפטים
יא תמוז תש"ל = 15.7.70
מס' תהליך 45421

העתק: מר מ. קומסר
מר ש. דיבון
קציין העתונות
נציגות ישראל באו"ם, ניו-יורק

ירושלים, ט׳ תמוז תש"ל
13 יולי 1970

45421

אל: מר מ. קופיי, משרד החוץ
מר ז. דיבון, משרד החוץ

הנדון: קבוצת העבודה המיוחדת של ועדת
האו"ם לזכויות האדם

אודה לך אם תודיעני אם יש התפתחות בענין הקמת צוות פגימי, כין-מסרדי, שיאסוף חומר נגד הטענות וההאשמות שהועלו ע"י קבוצת העבודה, כדי שניתן יהיה להשתמש בחומר זה במידת הצורך לצרכי הסברה.

ב ב ר כ ה,

פאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ירושלים, ט' תמוז תש"ל
13 יולי 1970

45421

לכבוד
הליגה לזכויות האדם והאזרח
ת.ד. 20178
תל-אביב

רבותי,

הריני מאשר בזאת קבלת מכתבכם מיום 10 ביולי 1970, אל שר המשטרה.

בכבוד רב,

עוזי סיון
מנהל לשכת השר

(4) כל אדם זכאי לאגד אגודות מקצועיות ולהצטרף לאגודות כדי להגן על עניניו.

סעיף 24.
כל אדם זכאי למנוחה ולפנאי, ובכלל זה הגבלת שעות העבודה במידה המתקבלת על הדעת וחופשה בשכר לעתים מזומנות.

סעיף 25.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לרמת חיים נאותה לבריאותם ולרווחתם, שלו ושל בני ביתו, לרבות מזון, לבוש, שיכון, טיפול רפואי, שירותים סוציאליים כדרוש וזכות לביטוח במקרה של אבטלה, מחלה, אי־כושר לעבודה, אלמון, זקנה או מחסור אחר בנסיבות שאינן תלויות בו.
(2) אימהות וילדים זכאים לטיפול מיוחד ולסיוע. כל הילדים, בין שנולדו בנישואין או שלא בנישואין, ייהנו במידה שווה מהגנה סוציאלית.

סעיף 26.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לחינוך. החינוך יינתן חינם, לפחות בשלבים הראשונים והיסודיים; החינוך בשלב הראשון הוא חובה, החינוך הטכני והמקצועי יהיה מצוי לכול, והחינוך הגבוה יהיה פתוח לכול במידה שווה ועל יסוד הכישרון.
(2) החינוך יכוון לפיתוחה המלא של האישיות ולטיפוח יחס כבוד לזכויות האדם ולחירויות היסודיות; החינוך יטפח הבנה, סובלנות וידידות בין כל העמים והקיבוצים הגזעיים והדתיים, ויסייע למאמץ של האומות המאוחדות לקיים את השלום.
(3) להורים זכות בכורה לבחור את דרך החינוך לילדיהם.

סעיף 27.
(1) כל אדם זכאי להשתתף תוך חירות בחייו התרבותיים של הציבור, ליהנות מאמנויות ולהיות שותף בהתקדמות המדע ובברכתו.
(2) כל אדם זכאי להגנת האינטרסים המוסריים והחומריים הכרוכים בכל יצירה מדעית, ספרותית, או אמנותית שהיא פרי רוחו.

סעיף 28.
כל אדם זכאי למשטר חברתי ובין־לאומי, שבו אפשר יהיה לקיים במלואן את הזכויות והחירויות אשר נקבעו בהכרזה זו.

סעיף 29.
(1) כל אדם יש לו חובות כלפי הכלל, כי רק בתוך הכלל נתונה לו האפשרות להתפתחות החופשית והמלאה של אישיותו.

(2) לא יוגבל אדם בזכויותיו ובחירויותיו, פרט לאותן ההגבלות שנקבעו בחוק על מנת להבטיח את ההכרה בזכויות ובחירויות של הזולת ואת יחס הכבוד אליהן, וכן את מילוי הדרישות הצודקות של הקוסר, של הסדר הציבורי ושל טובת הכלל בתוך חברה דמוקרטית.
(3) לעולם לא ישתמשו בזכויות ובחירויות אלה בניגוד למטרותיהן ולעקרונותיהן של האומות המאוחדות.

סעיף 30.
שום דבר בהכרזה זו לא יתפרש כאילו הוא בא להקנות למדינה, לציבור או ליחיד כל זכות שהיא לעסוק בפעולה או לבצע מעשה שתכליתם לקפח כל זכות או חירות מן הזכויות והחירויות הקבועות בהכרזה זאת.

הליגה לזכויות האדם והאזרח

מסונפת אי

הליגה הבינלאומית לזכויות האדם

ניו־יורק

ת"ד 20178, **תל־אביב.**

ההכרזה העולמית על זכויות האדם

דברי הקדמה

הואיל והכרה בכבוד הטבעי אשר לכל בני משפחת האדם ובזכויותיהם השוות והבלתי נפקעות היא יסוד החופש, הצדק והשלום בעולם,

הואיל והזלזול בזכויות האדם וביזוין הבשילו מעשים פראיים שפגעו קשה במצפונה של האנושות; ובנין עולם, שבו ייהנו כל יצורי אנוש מחירות הדיבור והאמונה ומן החירות מפחד וממחסור, הוכרז כראש שאיפותיו של כל האדם,

הואיל והכרח חיוני הוא שזכויות האדם יהיו מוגנות בכוח שלטונו של החוק, שלא יהא האדם אנוס, כמפלט אחרון, להשליך את יהבו על מרידה בעריצות ובדיכוי,

הואיל והכרח חיוני הוא לקדם את התפתחותם של יחסי ידידות בין האומות,

הואיל והעמים המאוגדים בארגון האומות המאוחדות חזרו ואישרו במגילת את אמונתם בזכויות היסוד של האדם, בכבודה ובערכה של אישיותו ובזכות שווה לגבר ולאשה; ומנוי וגמור אתם לסייע לקדמה חברתית ולהעלאת רמת החיים בתוך יתר חירות,

הואיל והמדינות החברות התחייבו לפעול, בשיתוף עם ארגון האומות המאוחדות, לטיפוח יחס כבוד כללי אל זכויות האדם ואל חירויות היסוד והקפדה על קיומן,

הואיל והבנה משותפת במהותן של זכויות וחירויות אלה הוא תנאי חשוב לקיומה השלם של התחייבות זו,

לפיכך

מכריזה העצרת הכללית

את ההכרזה העולמית הזאת בדבר זכויות האדם כרמת תישגים כללית לכל העמים והאומות, כדי שכל יחיד וכל גוף חברתי ישוות תמיד לנגד עיניו וישאף לטפח, דרך הוראה וחינוך, יחס של כבוד אל הזכויות ואל החירויות הללו, ולהבטיח באמצעים הדרגתיים, לאומיים ובין־לאומיים, שההכרה

בעקרונות אלה וההקפדה עליהם תהא כללית ויעילה בקרב אוכלוסי המדינות החברות ובקרב האוכלוסים שבארצות שיפוטן.

סעיף 1.
כל בני האדם נולדו בני חורין ושווים בערכם ובזכויותיהם. כולם חוננו בתבונה ובמצפון, לפיכך חובה עליהם לנהוג איש ברעהו ברוח של אחוה.

סעיף 2.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לכל הזכויות והחירויות שנקבעו בהכרזה זו ללא הפליה כולשהי מטעמי גזע, צבע, מין, לשון, דת, דעה פוליטית או דעה בבעיות אחרות, בגלל מוצא לאומי או חברתי, קניין, לידה או סטאטוס אחר.
(2) נדולה מזו, לא יופלה אדם על פי מעמדה המדינה, על פי סמכותה או על פי מעמדה הבין־לאומי של המדינה או הארץ שאליה הוא שייך, בין שהארץ היא עצמאית, ובין שהיא נתונה לנאמנות, בין שהיא נטולת שלטון עצמי ובין שריבונותה מוגבלת כל הגבלה אחרת.

סעיף 3.
כל אדם יש לו הזכות לחיים, לחירות ולביטחון אישי.

סעיף 4.
לא יהא שום אדם עבד או משועבד; עבדות וסחר עבדים ייאסרו לכל צורותיהם.

סעיף 5.
לא יהא שום אדם נתון לעינויים, ולא ליחס או לעונש אכזריים, לא־אנושיים או משפילים.

סעיף 6.
כל אדם זכאי להיות מוכר בכל מקום כאישיות בפני החוק.

סעיף 7.
הכול שווים לפני החוק וזכאים ללא הפליה להגנה שווה של החוק. הכול זכאים להגנה שווה מפני כל הפליה המפירה את מצוות ההכרזה הזאת ומפני כל הסתה להפליה כזו.

סעיף 8.
כל אחד זכאי לתקנה יעילה מטעם בתי הדין הלאומיים המוסמכים נגד מעשים המפירים את זכויות היסוד שניתנו לו על־פי החוקה או החוק.

סעיף 9.
לא ייאסר אדם, לא ייעצר ולא יוגלה באופן שרירותי.

סעיף 10.
כל אדם זכאי, מתוך שוויון גמור עם זולתו, למשפט הוגן ופומבי של בית־דין בלתי תלוי וללא משוא פנים בשעה שבאים לקבוע זכויותיו וחובותיו ולברר כל אשמה פלילית שהובאה נגדו.

סעיף 11.
(1) אדם שנאשם בעבירה פלילית הוא בחזקת זכאי, עד שהוכחה אשמתו כחוק במשפט פומבי שבו ניתנו לו כל הערובות הדרושות להגנתו.
(2) לא יורשע אדם בעבירה פלילית על מעשה או על הזנחה שלא נחשבו בשעתם לעבירה פלילית לפי החוק הלאומי או הבין־לאומי. לא יוטל עונש חמור מהעונש שהיה נוהג בזמן שעבר את העבירה הפלילית.

סעיף 12.
לא יהא אדם נתון להתערבות שרירותית בחייו הפרטיים, במשפחתו, במעונו, בחליפת מכתבים שלו, ולא לפגיעה בכבודו או בשמו הטוב. כל אדם זכאי להגנת החוק בפני התערבות או פגיעה כאלה.

סעיף 13.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לחופש תנועה ומגורים בתוך כל מדינה.
(2) כל אדם זכאי לעזוב כל ארץ, לרבות ארצו, ולחזור אל ארצו.

סעיף 14.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לבקש ולמצוא בארצות אחרות מקלט מרדיפות.
(2) אין להסתמך על זכות זו במקרה של האשמה פלילית שמקורה האמיתי במעשי פשע לא־מדיניים או במעשים שהם בניגוד למטרותיהן ולעקרונותיהן של האומות המאוחדות.

סעיף 15.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לאזרחות.
(2) לא תישלל מאדם אזרחותו דרך שרירות ולא תקופח דרך שרירות זכותו להחליף את אזרחותו.

סעיף 16.
(1) כל איש ואשה שהגיעו לפרקם רשאים לבוא בברית הנישואים ולהקים משפחה, ללא כל הגבלה מטעמי גזע, אזרחות או דת. הם זכאים לזכויות שוות במעשה הנישואים בתקופת הנישואים ובשעת בימולם.
(2) הנישואים יוכרו רק בהסכמתם החופשית והמלאה של שני בני הזוג העתידים.
(3) המשפחה היא היחידה הקבוצתית היסודית והטבעית של החברה והיא זכאית להגנת החברה והמדינה.

סעיף 17.
(1) כל אדם זכאי להיות בעל קניין, בין לבדו ובין ביחד עם אחרים.
(2) לא יישלל מאדם קניינו בדרך שרירותית.

סעיף 18.
כל אדם זכאי לחירות המחשבה, המצפון והדת; חירות זו כוללת את הזכות להמיר את דתו או את אמונתו ולתת בטוי לדתו או לאמונתו, לבדו או בציבור, ברשות היחיד או ברשות הרבים, דרך הוראה, נוהג, פולחן ושמירת מצוות.

סעיף 19.
כל אדם זכאי לחירות הדעה והביטוי, לרבות החירות להחזיק בדעות ללא כל הפרעה, ולבקש ידיעות ודעות, ולקבלן ולמסרן בכל הדרכים וללא סייגי גבולות.

סעיף 20.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לחירות התכנסות וההתאגדות.
(2) אין לכפות על שום אדם להיות חבר באיגוד מסוים.

סעיף 21.
(1) כל אדם זכאי להשתתף בהנהלת ארצו, בין השתתפות ישירה ובין דרך נציגות שנבחרה בבחירות חפשיות.
(2) כל אדם זכאי לשוויון בכניסה לשירות במנגנון של ארצו.
(3) רצון העם הוא היסוד לסמכותה של הממשלה. העם יביע את רצונו בבחירות כשרות הנשנות לעתים מזומנות, לפי זכות בחירה כללית ושווה ובהצבעה חשאית, או לפי סדר של בחירה חפשית וכיוצא בזה.

סעיף 22.
כל אדם, כחבר החברה, זכאי לביטחון סוציאלי וזכאי לתבוע שהזכויות הכלכליות הסוציאליות והתרבותיות, שהן חיוניות לכבודו כאדם ולהתפתחות התופשית של אישיותו, יובטחו במאמץ לאומי ובשיתוף פעולה בין־לאומי בהתאם לארגונה ולאוצרותיה של כל מדינה.

סעיף 23.
(1) כל אדם זכאי לעבודה, לבחירה חופשית של עבודתו, לתנאי עבודה צודקים והוגנים ולהגנה מפני אבטלה.
(2) כל אדם, ללא כל הפליה, זכאי לשכר שווה בעד עבודה שווה.
(3) כל עובד זכאי לשכר צודק והוגן, אשר יבטיח לו ולבני ביתו קיום הראוי לכבוד האדם שיושלם, אם יהיה צורך בכך, על־ידי אמצעים אחרים של הגנה סוציאלית.

משרד ראש הממשלה

ארכיון המדינה

טופס מראה מקום להוצאת תעודות יחידות*

חטיבה מס': 6

מיכל מס': 5756

תאריך התעודה: 10.7.70 (שנה)

שם מחבר התעודה: דר שמחה אלטלטיק (11)

תיק מס': 15

שם הנמען: 1) שר המשטרה
שר המשפטים
2) שר המשפטים
דר שמחה אלטלטיק

סוג התעודה (סמן √ במקום המתאים):

- [x] מכתב (2)
- [ ] מברק
- [ ] תזכיר או מיזכר
- [ ] דין וחשבון או זכרון דברים משיחה או דיון
- [ ] פרוטוקול של שיחה, דיון או ישיבה

*הטופס ימולא בשני עותקים. העותק הירוק יוכנס לתיק במקום התעודה שהוצאה; העותק הלבן יצורף לתעודה שהוצאה.

ירושלים, כ"ז בסיון תשל
1 ביולי 1970

אל: משרד החוץ, מגן מנהל מש"מ א'

הנדון: עדות הישראלי אבילאה בענני הוועדה לשטחים
מכתבך מס' 259 (212.3.1) מיום 28 ביוני 1970

לדעתי חיוני להפיץ תוכן עדותו של ידידי אבילאה לעתונות הישראלית כדי שהשקרים הרבים שלו יזכו להדים נאותים.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
יועץ משפטי למשלה

העתק: מר ז. דורון

ירושלים, כ"ז בסיון תשל"
1 ביולי 1970

אל: משרד החוץ, סגן מנהל מאו"מ א'

הנדון: עדות הישראלי אבילאה בפני הוועדה לשטחים
מכתבך מס' 259 (212.3.1) מיום 28 ביוני 1970

לדעתי חיוני להמיץ תוכן עדותו של יוסף אבילאה לעתונות הישראלית כדי שהשקרים הרבים שלו יזכו להדים נאותים.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
יועץ משפטי לממשלה

העתק: מר ז. דורון

ירושלים, כ"ד סיון תש"ל
28 ביוני 1970

מס' 259 (212.3.1)

אל: מר מ. קומיי, היועץ המדיני (לשמור לשובו)

מאת: סגן מנהל מאו"ם א'

הנדון: עדות חשראלי אבילאה בפני הוועדה לשטחים

מצורפות בזה שתי הודעות לעתונות של או"ם (520/NG , 521/NG) על עדותו של יוסף אבילאה מ"הליגה הישראלית לזכויות האדם והאזרח", בפני הוועדה לשטחים ביום 12.6.70.

לפי מיטב ידיעתנו, זהו העד האחרון עד כה. יתכן שה"ליגה" בחרה לשגר לוועדה איש זה, שאינו מזוהה כאחרים עם רק"ח ושי"ח או מצפן.

מסתבר כי ה"ליגה" שלחה לוועדה תזכיר הכולל קטעי עתונות על עוצר, הריסת בתים וכפרים, מעצרים מינהליים, עינויים והחזקת בן-ערובה, וכי העד חזר על כמה מההאשמות והוסיף עליהן האשמות גסות משלו.

מאידך, מבין השיטין של עדותו, הביע גם דברים חיוביים (שאולי לא המכוון להם, בבחינת "מעשה בלעם"). למשל:

א) ישראל השמיטה ממכניות הלימודים העמולה שנאה בשטחים לפני 1967.
ב) החוק (בקשר למעצרים מינהליים) מבוצע בהלכה, ניתנת הגנת משפטית וכו'.
ג) הקונסול האמריקני אמר לו כי בהשוואה לכיבוש האמריקני בגרמניה הישראלים ליברלים מאוד.
ד) "המצב אולי אינו כה שחור כפי שמציירים אותו".
ה) ישראל דמוקרטית ויש בה חופש ביטוי (אך לא בשטחים).
ו) הערבים תוקפים (קרי: רוצחים) זה את זה.
ז) המושל הצבאי אמר לו כי ברצונו לצמצם ככל האפשר את המעורבות בחיי התושבים ולאפשר להם לחיות חיים תקינים ככל האפשר.
ח) יהודים גרו בעבר בחברון, אך היה שם טבח ב-1948 (הכוונה ל-1929 או לגוש עציון?).
ט) ה"ליגה" נחשבת כמכשיר תעמולה קומוניסטי ולאנשיה מיוחסים "מניעים פוליטיים".
י) ה"ליגה" מקבלת ידיעות עתונאיות בעובדות בדוקות.

2/..

לא לשווא הביע יו"ר הוועדה אכזבה מעדותו של מר אבילאה.

עם זאת, העדות בכללותה היא שלילית הרבה יותר מחיובית, למרות שבדבריו לכתב "הארץ" (24.6.70) ניסה העד לשוות לעדותו אופי אובייקטיבי.

ב ב ר כ ה,

צ. נאמן

העתק (בצרוף ההודעות לעתונות):

מר מ. שמגר, היועץ המשפטי לממשלה, משרד המשפטים
מא"ל ד. דוידי, ראש ענף ממשל צבאי/עמכ"ל
מא"ל ד. שפי, מרקליטות צבאית ראשית/עמכ"ל
מר צ. רפיח, יועץ מדיני לשר המשטרה
מר פ. אליאב, מנהל מאוס ב' וקע"ח

אבא יקר

נמסר לתיעוד

לדורות

13

לכבוד
ההתאגדות הבינלאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטיים

הנדון: סעיד לוטפי עותמאן אואלאד סלימן
מכתבכם מיום 11 במאי 1970

עם קבלת מכתבכם בקש שר המשפטים לברר את הענין המעלה במכתבכם.

לאחר בדיקה יסודית של כל העובדות המתיחסות לענינו של עוה"ד סעיד לוטפי, יש בידי להודיעכם כי הנ"ל נתפס ע"י שלטונות הבטחון כשהוא עומד בראש רשת של מרגלים שעסקו בפעילות ריגול עבור המודיעין המצרי.

איננו סובר כי יהיה זה לגבוה להתווכח עם האשמות המעלות במכתבכם בדבר אופי השלטון הישראלי. עם זאת תסכימו בודאי כמשפטנים כי מדינה במצב לוחמה, רשאית למנוע פעילות ריגול בהחומיה, גם לפי כל האמנות הבינלאומית העוסקות בכך.

עלי להפנות תשומת לבכם לכך שכשם שסעיד לוטפי לא נעצר בשל דעותיו אלא בשל מעשי הריגול שלו, כך לא נעצר בישראל אף אדם אחד בשל דעותיו ומי שאומר אחרת אינו אומר את האמת, בין ביודעין ובין בשוגג.

אודה לך מאד אם תמסור עובדה זאת לכל חברי ההתאגדות שלכם.

בכבוד רב,

לכבוד
ההתאגדות הבינלאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטיים

הנדון: <u>סעיד לוטפי עוזמאן אוזלאר סליפן</u>
מכתבכם מיום 11 במאי 1970

עם קבלת מכתבכם בקש שר המשפטים לברר את הענין המעלה במכתבכם.

לאחר בדיקה יסודית של כל העובדות המתיחסות לענינו של עות"ד סעיד לוטפי, יש בידי להודיעכם כי הנ"ל נתפס ע"י שלטונות הבטחון כשהוא עומד בראש רשת של מרגלים שעסקו בפעילות ריגול עבור המודיעין המצרי.

איננו סובר כי יהיה זה לכבוד להתווכח עם האשמות המעלות במכתבכם בדבר אופי השלטון הישראלי. עם זאת תסכימו בודאי כמשפטנים כי מדינה במצב לוחמה, רשאית למנוע פעילות ריגול בתחומיה, גם לפי כל האמנות הבינלאומית העוסקות בכך.

עלי להפנות תשומת לבכם לכך שכשם שסעיד לוטפי לא נעצר בשל דעותיו אלא בשל מעשי הריגול שלו, כך לא נעצר בישראל אף אדם אחד בשל דעותיו ומי שאומר אחרת איננו אומר את האמת, בין ביודעין ובין בשוגג.

אודה לך מאד אם תמסור עובדה תשובה זאת לכל חברי ההתאגדות שלכם.

בכבוד רב,

בכבוד רב,

אנא כל מאמר אם עסקת בנושא שאינו נאמן בכל עבר מתאימות מקצוע.

אנחנו אם נשמע כיל הרגשה נכון כתנך.
מלחמה מתרחש אנא, כל קו נאמר הפסאתן אל אנו אתה מתן בנוגע נגם מאוחר אחרון אנא
אנא בנוגע שנעשה בקבל בכל מאמר מלחמה ברשתי קו נאמר מתן נוגע אנא מתן

בקצרה תאמינו נרחק כשנעשה, לם נגיר כך מאמרנו מתרחשים מתרחשנו ובכל.
אנא מתקבל שמתרחש. אם נאם מסכנה נגיע כמתמנים כי מרגיש כמאד בנאמנו, נאמנו
אנחנו מרגיש כי אנחנו נו בכבוד בשעבוד אם שמעתי מתאנו כמכתבה כבר

מרגיש מאמר כמאמינו נרחק אנו מתרחש! מאנא.
אם נאנו בעוברתכם כי מתמיד נשם אנא מתרחש מאמר נגיע מאמר נגם אם
ראשי מרגיש מגיעו אם כך מתבנו מתרחשנו בנוגע אם אנו מאנו בנגיע.

אם לחנו מכתבכם אנא אם שמתמים בבר אם עדיו מאנו מכתבכם.

מכתבכם מגיע זו כמאי 1010
מגיע: בבר בנאמנ מנכחו מאמרי בנאמנ

שמתרגנו מבינתכם אם מתמנים נבינתכם
בכבוד

לכבוד
התאגדות הבינלאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטיים

הנדון: <u>סעיד לוטפי עותמאן אונאלאד סליבן</u>
מכתבכם מיום 11 במאי 1970

עם קבלת מכתבכם בקש שר המשפטים לברר את הענין המעלה במכתבכם.

לאחר בדיקה יסודית של כל העובדות המתיחסות לענינו של עו"ד סעיד לוטפי, יש בידי להודיעכם כי הנ"ל נתפס ע"י שלטונות הבטחון בשחוא עומד בראש רשת של מרגלים שעסקו בפעילות ריגול עבור המודיעין המצרי.

איננני סובר כי יהיה זה לכבוד להתווכח עם האשמות המעלות במכתבכם בדבר אופי השלטון הישראלי. עם זאת תסכימו בודאי כמשפטנים כי מדינה במצב לוחמה, רשאית למנוע פעילות ריגול בתחומיה, גם לפי כל האמנות הבינלאומיות העוסקות בכך.

עלי להפנות תשומת לבכם לכך שבשם שסעיד לוטפי לא נעצר בשל דעותיו אלא בשל מעשי הריגול שלו, כך לא נעצר בישראל אף אדם אחד בשל דעותיו ומי שאומר אחרת איננו אומר את האמת, בין ביודעין ובין בשוגג.

אודה לך מאד אם תמסור עובדה תשובה זאת לכל חברי התאגדות שלכם.

בכבוד רב,

A6

Jérusalem, le 3 Juillet 1970

45421

Monsieur Joe Nordmann,
Secretaire Général de l'Association
Internationale des Juristes Démocrates,
49 Avenue Jupiter,
Bruxelles,
Belgique.

Monsieur,

Sujet: Votre lettre du 11 Mai 1970

Le Ministre de la Justice m'a chargé d'accuser réception de votre lettre concernant Me Mohammed Said Loutfi et de vous informer que les allégations y contenues ont été examinées à fond.

Il appert que Me Mohammed Said Loutfi a été arrêté pour actes d'espionage commis durant une période prolongée.

Il faut souligner que l'allégation faite dans votre lettre, que Me Loutfi a été en raison de ses opinions politiques est dénuée de tout fondement. C'est uniquement son activité comme espion qui a été la cause de son arrestation, et je tiens à faire remarquer que personne n'a été arrêté dans les territoires occupés par Israel en raison de ses opinions.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma parfaite considération.

Uzi Sivan
CHEF DE BUREAU DU MINISTRE
DE LA JUSTICE

לכבוד

ר' צ. סו

שר המשפטים הורני לאשר קבלת מכתבכם בקשר לעו"ד מוחמד סעיד לוספי ולהביא לידיעתכך כי הטענות שהועלו במכתבכם האמור נבדקו באופן מלא.

כפי שמתברר נעצר עו"ד מוחמד סעיד לוספי באשמת מעשי ר י ג ו ל אותן ביצע במשך תקופה ממושכת.

יודגש כי אין כל יסוד לטענה הכוזבת המועלת במכתבכם כאילו נעצר מר לוספי בקשר לדעותיו הפוליטיות: פעילותו כמרגל היא אשר שמשה כאמור סיבה יחידה למעצרו ורצוני להדגיש כי איננו נעצר בשטחים המוחזקים ע"י ישראל בשל השקפותיו ודעותיו.

יעמוס רבי
לוי יוסף

~~הערה: לדעתי צריך מכתב זה להחתם על-ידך ולא ע"י השר.~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES JURISTES DÉMOCRATES
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DEMOCRATIC LAWYERS
МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ АССОЦИАЦИЯ ЮРИСТОВ ДЕМОКРАТОВ
ASOCIACION INTERNACIONAL DE JURISTAS DEMOCRATAS
國際民主法律家協會
رابطة الحقوقيين الديموقراطيين العالمية

Siège : 49, avenue Jupiter, Bruxelles 19 - Téléphone : 45.14.71
Adresse télégraphique : Interjurist Bruxelles

Bruxelles, le 11 mai 1970

Monsieur le Ministre de la Justice

TEL AVIV

- Israël -

Monsieur le Ministre,

L'Association Internationale des Juristes Démocrates vient d'apprendre qu'un procès était en cours contre Me Mohammed Saïd Loutfi qui a été arrêté à El Arich par les autorités israéliennes.

Ces mesures qui frappent un juriste particulièrement attaché à la dignité de sa profession soulignent une fois encore les aspects dramatiques de la répression qui sévit dans les territoires occupés par les forces armées d'Israël.

Devant ces faits, l'A.I.J.D. tient à vous exprimer les vives préoccupations des dizaines de milliers d'avocats, de magistrats et de professeurs qu'elle compte dans ses rangs. Elle demande la mise en liberté immédiate de Me Loutfi. Pour celui-ci, comme pour toutes les personnes détenues et poursuivies dans les territoires occupés en raison de leurs opinions politiques et de leur attachement à leur patrie, l'A.I.J.D. réclame le respect intégral des droits fondamentaux de la personne et spécialement des droits de défense et de recours.

.../...

L'A.I.J.D. est une Organisation non gouvernementale ayant le statut consultatif auprès du Conseil économique et social des Nations Unies et de l'UNESCO.

Nous souhaiterions être tenus au courant de la situation de Me Loutfi et des suites qui seraient éventuellement données à nos précédentes démarches.

Nous vous prions d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de notre haute considération.

Joë Nordmann

Joë NORDMANN
Secrétaire général

משרד ראש הממשלה

ארכיון המדינה

טופס מראה מקום להוצאת תעודות יחידות*

חטיבה מסי: ב

מיכל מסי: 5756

תיק מסי: 15

תאריך התעודה: 5.7.70

שם מחבר התעודה: ד. סקל

שם הנמען: הי"ר הממשלה

סוג התעודה (סמן √ במקום המתאים):

- [x] מכתב + 2 דו"חות תצורפים
- [ ] מברק
- [ ] תזכיר או מיזכר
- [ ] דין וחשבון או זכרון דברים משיחה או דיון
- [ ] פרוטוקול של שיחה, דיון או ישיבה

*הטופס ימולא בשני עותקים. העותק הירוק יוכנס לתיק במקום התעודה שהוצאה; העותק הלבן יצורף לתעודה שהוצאה.

ירושלים, א' בתמוז תש"ל
5 ביולי 1970

<u>דחוף - שמור</u>

45421

אל: ד"ר ר. כגרל, מנהל מח' חביעות, משרד החוץ

הנדון: <u>פניית מר מרק כהן לועדה לזכויות האדם</u>

... 1. לוסה מכתבו של מר מגן משרדי בלגוית מעתק תצו אליך מתיימה
... ד"ר מגן במכתבו.

2. אם המבקשו הרשים נוסעים תוכלו להתקשר ישירות עם ד"ר מגן.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

ירושלים, א' בתמוז תש"ל
5 ביולי 1970

דחוף - שמור

45421

אל: ד"ר ר. מגדל, מנהל מח' תביעות, משרד החוץ

הנדון: מניית מר מרק כהן לועדה לזכויות האדם

1. לוטה מכתבו של מר סבט ממשרדי בלוויה העתק הנד אליך ממייתם ד"ר סבט במכתבו.

2. אם תבקשו מרשים נוספים תוכלו להתקשר ישירות עם ד"ר סבט.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מאיר שמגר
היועץ המשפטי לממשלה

משרד ראש הממשלה

ארכיון המדינה

טופס מראה מקום להוצאת תעודות יחידות*

חטיבה מסי: 3

מיכל מסי: 5756

תיק מסי: 15

תאריך התעודה: 23.6.70

שם מחבר התעודה: ד"ר ר. מגר

שם הנמען: הי. ורל. הרשמי ל"ה המשטרה

סוג התעודה (סמן √ במקום המתאים):

- [x] מכתב (רק 3 עמודים מצורפים)
- [ ] מברק
- [ ] תזכיר או מיזכר
- [ ] דין וחשבון או זכרון דברים משיחה או דיון
- [ ] פרוטוקול של שיחה, דיון או ישיבה

*הטופס ימולא בשני עותקים. העותק הירוק יוכנס לתיק במקום התעודה שהוצאה; העותק הלבן יצורף לתעודה שהוצאה.

משרד ראש הממשלה

ארכיון המדינה

טופס מראה מקום להוצאת תעודות יחידות*

חטיבה מס': ב

מיכל מס': 5756

תיק מס': 15

תאריך התעודה: 19.6.70

שם מחבר התעודה: דר ג. רבר

שם הנמען: מנהל לשכת שר השפטים

סוג התעודה (סמן √ במקום המתאים):

- [x] מכתב (גרסא מכתב מקורי)
- [ ] מברק
- [ ] תזכיר או מיזכר
- [ ] דין וחשבון או זכרון דברים משיחה או דיון
- [ ] פרוטוקול של שיחה, דיון או ישיבה

*הטופס ימולא בשני עותקים. העותק הירוק יוכנס לתיק במקום התעודה שהוצאה; העותק הלבן יצורף לתעודה שהוצאה.

עלי גזוי
תשובה ל עמוד
11 שבתיה
ן

N

ירושלים, ד' סיון תש"ל
8 יוני 1970

45421

אל: פרקליט צבאי ראשי

מצ"ב מכתב מאת "התאגדות בין-לאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטיים" ותרגומו לעברית.

אודה לך אם תואיל להודות על העברת פרטים על המקרה הנזכר מאחר ויש בדעתנו להשיב לפנים.

ב ב ר כ ה,

עוזי סיון
מנהל לשכת השר

11

תרגום מלא

בהאגודה בין-לאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטים

בס"ד, 11 באב, תש"ל

לכבוד
שר המשפטים
תל-אביב

- ישראל -

אדוני השר

בהאגודה בין-לאומית של משפטנים דמוקרטים לבבה לחלוק כבוד עקרוני כי מנהל משפט נבון הוא בוודאי טוב לכולנו, שאדם בגלל-דתו לא יפגע בפעולות המשפטיות.

בדברי אלה הנוגעים למשפט פנאתי בראשה לאותו רגש שבראשונה, בדיון בעניין אי הכרה הבטחון של תפיסה בלתי חוקית בחלקים בתוך ובחומות המבצרים של ישראל.

לגבי אירועים אלה, נראה בהאגודה לנכון להדגיש בפניך את דאגתם הגדולה של שופטים אלה אזרחי בין שופטי ומיוחסותם, בעניינים משפטיים. היא מדגישה את שמירתו הבלתי מתפשרת של אזרח בין לבין. לאחרונה, בגלל כל אלה, הוגשו הרבה דרישות לבין בקשות בקשה של בעלות הסמכות לדאגה בעניינים, ולדאגה לאי הפגיעה בזכויות אלו בעניינים הנוגעים לדאגה ולדרישה.

הדרישה בדיון ובדיונו בראשה שבלי שום זכות של אזרח בין לבין ובין בתוך לבין בתוך לאומה בשלמותו הקדמית

הוא לא לקבל, אדוני השר, את הבקשה מלחמתו הנגלה.

בוואי נרדפן
מזכיר כללי

10

משטרת ישראל

המטה הארצי/מחלקת החקירות
ירושלים, כס' באייר תש"ל
(4.6.70)
43407 - 10769/מ

5

היועץ המשפטי לממשלה
ירושלים

8.6.70 = ל' סיון תש"ל
45421

הנדון: חסן מרחמד אבו רמאל
סמוכין: מכתבך מיום 6.5.70

1. חקירתנו העלתה כי:

הנדון בעצר והואשם בעבירה על במחרון המדינה.עם גמר חקירתו הועבר לבית מעצר יגור.

2. לפי בקשתו הובא אליו רופא מקופ"ח בצרת - עלית אשר בדק אותו וקבע כי הוא מסוגל להיות במעצר.

3. שמיעת משפטו נקבעה ל-31.5.70 בבימ"ש צבאי בלוד.

בברכה

ש. זהר, נצ"מ
ראש מחלקת החקירות

בכ/.

12-68-4000/100

מ 1053/א

9

<u>עמרן</u>

ירושלים, יו' באייר תש"ל
21 במאי 1970

אל: מר מ. קידרון, הנציגות ע"י תאו"ם, ג'נבה

העתק: מ. קרסיי, יועץ לשה"ח

27/5/70

הנדון: <u>יחסים עם הצלב-האדום הביגלאומי</u>

כאשר רושם היום אצל שה"ח ב-4 למאי ביקש ידיעות והבהרות על שלושת דברים ספציפיים הנוגעים לשטחים המוחזקים דהייבו העברתם כביכול של תושבי עזה לגדה המערבית, סגירת שטח בתברון, והפקעת קרקעות בחירבת אל-זכריה. הגני מצרף העתק המכתב שכתבתי לרושם ב-17 למאי 70.

...

מוריון היה אצלי אתמול בענין אחר. ציין שמכתבי הב"ל נשלח ליועה הביגלאומית לעיון ולכן עליו להמנע בשלב זה מתגובה רשמית. בכל זאת, במהלך השיחה העיר כמה הערות באורח אישי, כדלקמן -

א. הפיגור במסירת המכתב עורר אי סבלנות רחוב (לא פיזם אצל מי אך רמז שרושם לחץ עליו ולכן היה נאלץ להסריד אותי). מוריון הסביר לאחרים שהייתי עסוק. שללתי את הגילוסה הזאת/מרציתי לבדוק עוב את העובדות.

ב. בקשר לחירבת אל-זכריה הציר מוריון שהסיבה המרפיעה בשכתבי, "שעמי בשחון" אמנם גרמה סבחיבת הצלב האדום והאמנה אך שיבגה הולמת מה שהוא שמע בעל-פה מתת-אלוף בזית ואח"כ מתת-אלוף זרדי. השבתי שבמביליבו המרמב "בשחון" הוא מורכב ביותר ואיבנו מדגבל רק לפעולות צה"ל. הסבתי חשומת לבו לכך שהקטע בשכתבי הנוגע לתברון מתיחס בפירוש ליחידה צבאית אך הקטע הנוגע לזכריה איבנו ערוה זאת. מוריון לא ביקש מתבי לפרש מה בדיוק יהיה השימוש בעשה הנזכר או על-ידי מי.

ג. מוריון הודה שהבעיה היסודית המעורדת מבחיבת דאות הרעדה הבי"ל היא דוקא הגדרת מעמדה וסמכותה בעביבים כאלה. יש בקרב הרעדה שתי השקפות שונות: ה"פרגמטיסטים" אשר מעוניבים בראש וראשונה לעמוד על אפשרות לעבוד כאן בהתוך פעולה עם השלטונות הישראליים, וה"עקרוניים" אשר מעוניבים בראש וראשונהלשמור על תוקפה של האמנה הרביעית שהתוות ייצור הצלב-האדום עצמו אינקריך להפעל בתור מכשיר בידי הצלב האדום גם בעתיד. בשביל האסכולה האחרונה, האמנה בוחבת לצלב האדום הקיד בתור שוליף ל"מעצמה סגיבה" כלפי תושבי שטחי כיבוש, ואסור לצלב האדום לוותר על המשימה ההומבורית הזאת.

2./.

על רקע זה, עלול להיות דיון יסודי בקרב הועדה אם להטלים
את הנאמר בסעיף הראשון בטכתבי דהייבו שהסכמו לתת תאיבנורמנית הסבוקשת
לדרשא אישית, טשעמי ביטוסיז, מבלי להכיר בזה בזכות הצלב האדום להתערב
בעניבים תאלה. הוא, מורידן שהבונן להטליז לטמוגים עליו למצוא מוצא
מהדילמה הזאת ע"י רישום המקידים המסורתיים אשר הצלב האדום מסלא אומם
כעת בארץ (ביקורים אבל אסיריט בבתי-סוהר, הטלמת שבויי מלחמה, איחוד
משפחות וכד') מבלי להגיד שהמקידיהם מוגבלים מקרובים לרשימה הזאת. אז
הצלב-האדום יכול להגיד לפונים אליו שאיבנו יכול לסמך עובדות והבהרות
על דברים אשר אינם בטיפולו המעשי.

השבתי, גם כן באורח אישי שסעיף הראשון בטכתבי לא בסקרת
מבוסת כפי שמבוסת. השאלה באמת לא היתה אם להשיב לפנית דרשא אלא אם
להכיר בזכות התערבות הצלב האדום. מורידן בודאי מבין היטב שלעולם לא
נקבל אפוטרופוס זר על ביתול השלטון בשטחים תאלה ועל אחת כמה וכמה לא
בעניבים הנוגעים למערכת הבטחון שלבו. לוא דרשא היה עומד על קבלת ידיעה
כזאת בתוקף מקידו, לא היה מקבל אותה מהשד או בכתב מפני. הועדה הבי"ל
כמובן רשאית להחליט מה שתחליט אך לא הייתי מייעץ לה לעשות שהדבר אתגר
כלפי מסיראל. הועדה תבא קירחת מזה ומזה. כלפי ישראל מחד היא תמתח חזית
עם ישראל, ומרמב שלא תשלה את עצמה שממישראל תיכבע ללחץ בבדון בבד רצונה.
מאידך הועדה תביב את עצמה כלפי הערבים ותומכיהם בתוך האחראים לאוכלוסיה
בשטחים, תהיה מרמקמת ומושמצת ע"י הערבים עצמם על אי יכולתה לשלא את
המקיד הזה למעשה.

מורידן לא התרוכח כלל עם ביתתי ויש לתגיז שיסבא דרך
להתמם בבימוקים.

השבתי כבבון לטסור לך דו"ח על השיחה, לסרות טלא היתה
רשמית.

ב ב ר כ ה,

מ. קרמיי

העתק: שה"ח
המבכ"ל
מר מ. שרון, מבכ"ל
יועץ המשפטי
מנהל מאו"מ א'
יועץ המשפטי לממשלה
תת-אלוף מ. בזים, מרד הבטחון

17 May 1970.

Dear Mr. Rochat,

At the meeting you had with the Foreign Minister on 4 May 1970, you enquired about three matters concerning the Israel-administered territories. You explained that you had been questioned about these matters in Geneva, and it would be helpful if you knew the facts. The Minister agreed that out of courtesy to you personally, you should be furnished with the information you wanted, without that implying that the I.C.R.C. as such was entitled to intervene in such questions. I am accordingly writing to confirm and amplify what the Minister said at the meeting.

Alleged transportation of population from the Gaza Strip

The Minister stated emphatically that there was no truth whatsoever in the Arab stories that elements of the Gaza population were being "transferred" against their will to the West Bank by the Israel authorities. No such measure had even been contemplated. On the other hand, it would be absurd to suggest that international law or morality required the present population of the Gaza Strip to remain cut off and segregated in the Gaza Strip, as had been the case for nineteen years under the Egyptian military regime. More than half of them were in any case not indigenous Gaza inhabitants, but refugees. The natural affinities of the Arabs in Gaza were with the Arabs in the West Bank, both areas having been part of mandatory Palestine. If any Gaza Arabs wished of their own free will to seek better wages and living conditions in the West Bank or elsewhere, we would regard this as natural and desirable, and would not discourage it.

Military area at Hebron

For reasons of security, the preservation of public law and order, and the curbing of terrorist activities, the military authorities had decided to station an army unit in the vicinity of Hebron. For this purpose, a limited area has been enclosed close to, but outside, the town. None of the land has been expropriated, and facilities have been provided for any existing civilian activities to be continued uninterrupted.

Khirbet el-Zakariya

Before your meeting with the Minister, the facts about this matter had already been explained to Mr. Moreillon by my colleague in the Ministry, Assistant Director-General Moshe Sasson. They are briefly as follows :

2205 dunams of land in the Gush Etzion area have been earmarked for security purposes. 860 dunams of this land is the property of the Jewish National Fund, and

formed part of the tract that was occupied and cultivated by the four Gush Etzion kibbutzim overrun and destroyed by the Jordanian Arab Legion in 1948, when their inhabitants were killed or taken prisoner. Since 1948, some local Arabs have squatted on this land and set up a few shacks. Although the Israel authorities do not recognize that these Arabs have any legal rights to the land, they have on purely humanitarian grounds been offered compensation and alternative land for cultivation.

The Arab-owned part of the land in question has not been expropriated. The owners have been offered a fair annual rental, taking into account any loss of income from crops. Wakf property and the site of the Tomb of Zakariya have been excluded from the requisitioning and are not affected by it.

I would point out that this is an important and sensitive strategic locality, dominating the surrounding area and controlling the southern approaches to Jerusalem. That factor influenced the establishment of Jewish villages at this locality before 1948, and the siting here of a Jordanian army camp after 1948.

Generally, it is our policy to refrain from requisitioning land for security purposes unless that is essential, and then to do so under conditions that avoid, or minimize to the greatest possible extent, any hardship or loss to local inhabitants.

Sincerely,

Michael Comay
Political Adviser to the Foreign Minister

Mr. Andre Rochat,
Delegate-General,
International Committee of the
Red Cross,
7 Avenue de la Paix,
Ch. 1211, Geneva 1.

17 May 1970

Dear Mr. Rochat,

At the meeting you had with the Foreign Minister on 4 May 1970, you enquired about three matters concerning the Israel-administered territories. You explained that you had been questioned about these matters in Geneva, and it would be helpful if you knew the facts. The Minister agreed that out of courtesy to you personally, you should be furnished with the information you wanted, without that implying that the I.C.R.C. as such was entitled to intervene in such questions. I am accordingly writing to confirm and amplify what the Minister said at the meeting.

Alleged transportation of population from the Gaza strip

The Minister stated emphatically that there was no truth whatsoever in the Arab stories that elements of the Gaza population were being "transferred" against their will to the West Bank by the Israel authorities. No such measure had even been contemplated. On the other hand, it would be absurd to suggest that international law or morality required the present population of the Gaza Strip to remain cut off and segregated in the Gaza in the Gaza Strip, as had been the case for nineteen years under the Egyptian military regime. More than half of them were in any case not indigenous Gaza inhabitants, but refugees. The natural affinities of the Arabs in Gaza were with the Arabs in the West Bank, both areas having been part of mandatory Palestine. If any Gaza Arabs wished of their own free will to seek better wages and living conditions in the West Bank or elsewhere, we would regard this as natural and desirable, and would not discourage it.

Military area at Hebron

For reasons of security, the preservation of public law and order, and the curbing of terrorist activities, the military authorities had decided to station an army unit in the vicinity of Hebron. For this purpose, a limited area has been enclosed close to, but outside, the town. None of the land has been expropriated, and facilities have been provided for any existing civilian activities to be continued uninterrupted.

Khirbet el-Zakariya

Before your meeting with the Minister, the facts about this matter had already been explained to Mr. Moreillon by my colleague in the Ministry. Assistant Director-General Moshe Sasson. They are briefly as follows:

2205 dunams of land in the Gush Etzion area have been earmarked for security purposes. 860 dunams of this land is the property of the Jewish National Fund, and formed part of the tract that was occupied and cultivated by the four Gush Etzion kibbutzim overrun and destroyed by the Jordanian Arab Legion in 1948, when their inhabitants were killed or taken prisoner. Since 1948, some local Arabs have squatted on this land and set up a few shacks. Although the Israel authorities do not recognize that these Arabs have any legal rights to the land, they have on purely humanitarian ground been offered compensation and alternative land for cultivation.

The Arab-owned part of the land in question has not been expropriated. The owners have been offered a fair annual rental, taking into account any loss of income from crops. Wakf property and the site of the Tomb of Zakariya have been excluded from the requisitioning and are not affected by it.

I would point out that this is an important and sensitive strategic locality, dominating the surrounding area and controlling the southern approaches to Jerusalem. That factor influenced the establishment of Jewish villages at this locality before 1948, and the siting here of a Jordanian army camp after 1948.

Generally, it is our policy to refrain from requisitioning land for security purposes unless that is essential, and then to do so under conditions that avoid, or minimize to the greatest possible extent, any hardship or loss to local inhabitants.

Sincerely, Michael Comay
Political Adviser to the Foreign Minister

Mr. Andre Rochat, Delegate-General,
International Committee of the Red Cross,
7 Avenue de la Paix, Ch. 1211, Geneva 1.

17 May 1970

Dear Mr. Rochat,

At the meeting you had with the Foreign Minister on 4 May 1970, you enquired about three matters concerning the Israel-administered territories. You explained that you had been questioned about these matters in Geneva, and it would be helpful if you knew the facts. The Minister agreed that out of courtesy to you personally, you should be furnished with the information you wanted, without that implying that the I.C.R.C. as such was entitled to intervene in such questions. I am accordingly writing to confirm and amplify what the Minister said at the meeting.

Alleged transportation of population from the Gaza strip

The Minister stated emphatically that there was no truth whatsoever in the Arab stories that elements of the Gaza population were being "transferred" against their will to the West Bank by the Israel authorities. No such measure had even been contemplated. On the other hand, it would be absurd to suggest that international law or morality required the present population of the Gaza Strip to remain cut off and segregated in the Gaza in the Gaza Strip, as had been the case for nineteen years under the Egyptian military regime. More than half of them were in any case not indigenous Gaza inhabitants, but refugees. The natural affinities of the Arabs in Gaza were with the Arabs in the West Bank, both areas having been part of mandatory Palestine. If any Gaza Arabs wished of their own free will to seek better wages and living conditions in the West Bank or elsewhere, we would regard this as natural and desirable, and would not discourage it.

Military area at Hebron

For reasons of security, the preservation of public law and order, and the curbing of terrorist activities, the military authorities had decided to station an army unit in the vicinity of Hebron. For this purpose, a limited area has been enclosed close to, but outside, the town. None of the land has been expropriated, and facilities have been provided for any existing civilian activities to be continued uninterrupted.

Khirbet el-Zakariya

Before your meeting with the Minister, the facts about this matter had already been explained to Mr. Moreillon by my colleague in the Ministry. Assistant Director-General Moshe Sasson. They are briefly as follows:

2205 dunams of land in the Gush Etzion area have been earmarked for security purposes. 860 dunams of this land is the property of the Jewish National Fund, and formed part of the tract that was occupied and cultivated by the four Gush Etzion kibbutzim overrun and destroyed by the Jordanian Arab Legion in 1948, when their inhabitants were killed or taken prisoner. Since 1948, some local Arabs have squatted on this land and set up a few shacks. Although the Israel authorities do not recognize that these Arabs have any legal rights to the land, they have on purely humanitarian ground been offered compensation and alternative land for cultivation.

The Arab-owned part of the land in question has not been expropriated. The owners have been offered a fair annual rental, taking into account any loss of income from crops. Wakf property and the site of the Tomb of Zakariya have been excluded from the requisitioning and are not affected by it.

I would point out that this is an important and sensitive strategic locality, dominating the surrounding area and controlling the southern approaches to Jerusalem. That factor influenced the establishment of Jewish villages at this locality before 1948, and the siting here of a Jordanian army camp after 1948.

Generally, it is our policy to refrain from requisitioning land for security purposes unless that is essential, and then to do so under conditions that avoid, or minimize to the greatest possible extent, any hardship or loss to local inhabitants.

Sincerely, Michael Comay
Political Adviser to the Foreign Minister

Mr. Andre Rochat, Delegate-General,
International Committee of the Red Cross,
7 Avenue de la Paix, Ch. 1211, Geneva 1.

75421

[illegible]

26/5/70

118

מדבר

ירושלים, ט"ו אייר תש"ל
21 במאי 1970

אל: מר מ. קומיי, יועץ מדיני לשר החוץ
מר מ. ששון, מנכ"ל (אח"כ למר י. אלכוב)
מר ש. ריבון, יועץ לענייני חסברה (אח"כ למר ז. סומוה)
מר ש. ארד, השגריר בהאג (בהמשך למכתבנו 49 מ-7.5.70)

מאת: סגן מנהל מאו"ם א'

תגרון: עדויות הישראלי וייגרס וההולנדי אלמאן
בפני הוועדה לשמחים

אני מצרף בזה, לעיונכם, את ההודעה לעתונות של או"ם, מס' SC/515 מ-4.5.70, הכוללת את עדויות העתונאי הישראלי וייגרס והעתונאי ההולנדי אלמאן בפני הוועדה לשמחים בג'נבה ב-1.5.70.

ההולנדי אינו מוכר לנו ותופעתו היתה לגו הפתעה לחלוטין. הישראלי מרים מראש את עובדת היענותו לשורקות שפרסמה הוועדה (ב"ג'רוזלם פוסט" ב-8.4.70 וב"הארץ" ב-9.4.70 בשפה[illegible]); ואנו השתייגנו בידוע מהופעה זו, שהמרה פובא בתמרה: לעומת הדרות ההסברתי המסויים שבה, הרי בטופו של דבר השאמש "הוכחה" בידי הוועדה הפרו-ערבית כי היא תסיקה את מסקנותיה (העוינת לגו כמובן) לאחר ששמעה כביכול את "שני הצדדים".

עם זאת, אין מניעה מצדנו שדבריהם המלאים של הישראלי - ומכל שכן, של ההולנדי - יקבלו פרסום מעל פיה אובייקטיבית. הששנו נגע מהתפגרת, אך לא מהתוכן.

אגב, כדאי לשים לב לשאלותיו ולתערוכיו המגמתיות של היו"ר הצ'ילוני.

להלן כמה עובדות נוספות לידיעתכם:

באירופה ובבירות ערב שמעה הוועדה לשמחים המורכבת מצ'ילון, יוגוסלביה וסומליה) כ-150 איש, מביניהם (בלונדון ב-2.4.70) המקרב הידוע משה מחובר מ"מצפן". כן נמסר שהוועדה תשמע (בניו יורק, בין 14 ל-21 ביוני) את ישראל שחק ואורי דיוויס, הידועים בהשמצותיהם.

ישראלי נוסף, אלכסנדר אבירם (משדרות חן 59, תל-אביב) כתב לנו בתחילת מאי כי נענה למודעות הוועדה והודיע לה על רצונו להעיד בשגיה, אך לא קבל הזמנה. האיש אינו מוכר לנו ולא ידוע לנו מה ההכוון להעדר; אך שלחנו לו מסמכים על עמדתנו כלפי הוועדה והצענו לו שגשוחה. הוא לא התקשר יותר.

הוועדה עומדת להביש את הדו"ח שלה למזכ"ל באבגוסט, והמזכ"ל יגישו לקצרה.

2/..

אשר לקבוצת העבודה שמטעם הוועדה לזכויות האדם, זו הגישה את דוחה לוועדה לזכויות האדם והוועדה קבלה החלטה (בקולות הערבים, המוסלמים והסובייטים בלבד; השאר נמנעו) אשר אשרה את הדו"ח נביגתה אם ישראל מריפות, וכן הטילה על קבוצת העבודה "כי תמשיך לחקור ולדווח על הפרות ישראליות"; ועל המזב"ל הטילה הוועדה לתת תקוצה מירבית לדו"ח קבוצת העבודה ובין היתר להביאו "לתשומת לב העצרת, מועבי"ם ואקוסו"ק". בפני העצדת יהיו איפוא שני דוחות-זוועה.

ג ב ר ב ה,

צ. נאמן

העתק: (בברוף ההודעות לעתונות של או"ם)
מר ס. שמגר, היועץ המשפטי לממשלה
מר ת. מירון, היועץ המשפטי, משה"ח
מר ש. אליאב, מנהל מאו"ם ב' ומ"מ דובר משה"ח

נאו"ם, ניו יורק
הנציגות, ג'נבה

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/515
4 May 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES HEARS WITNESSES IN GENEVA

Concludes Session; Scheduled to Meet in New York, 14-21 June to Hear Further Witnesses

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories concluded its current session on 2 May after hearing further remarks in Geneva by a representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Earlier, on 1 May, the Committee heard further witnesses at its meetings in Geneva.

The Committee will hold another session at United Nations Headquarters to hear more witnesses and consider the drafting of its report, 14-21 June.

Comments by ICRC Spokesman

At the meeting on 2 May, further information was given to the Special Committee by Claude Pilloud of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Mr. PILLOUD first made a statement in open session, and then the Committee went into closed session.

Mr. Pilloud said a "communique" (Press Release HR/513 issued in New York on 1 May) had been issued, purporting to sum up what he had previously said (on 30 April) in the Committee. He said it contained several inaccuracies and did not fully reflect what he had stated. He said the "communique" had been issued without consulting him.

(more)

The Chairman, H.S. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon), stated that it was standard policy for the Office of Public Information to issue a press release on the hearings of the Committee immediately after a meeting had taken place. It was not policy to consult those appearing before the Committee as to the contents of the press release.

Mr. PILLOUD first commented on a sentence in the press release reading: "He said, regarding the Geneva Convention, that Israel had not taken a very clear attitude regarding their applicability to the occupied territories."

Mr. Pilloud said he had been referring at that stage to a report of the ICRC to the effect that Israel had at the time said that the question of applicability of Article 4 should be kept open for the moment.

Regarding references in the press release to questions of visits to detainees at the time of arrest and the question of interpreters and the question of choice of prisoners to be visited, he said his remarks had been of a general character and not, in particular, applicable to Israel.

Mr. Pilloud said regarding references to Sarafand that he said that this prison did not appear on the list of establishments contained in its reports regarding the visits, especially for the first six months.

Mr. Pilloud said he also considered inaccurate the references regarding witnesses being present at some times when Red Cross officials visited those detained. In his view, the references in the press release to this particular matter were incomprehensible.

Subsequently, after questions by the Chairman, Mr. Pilloud said the references in question sounded better in English than in French.

Mr. Pilloud also stated his view that the press release should have reproduced Article 5 of the Convention in full.

The Chairman said he assumed that anybody reading the press release would also consult the text of the Convention.

The Chairman said he recalled that he had asked if Article 5 was "a regrettable escape clause", a reference quoted in the press release.

The Chairman said he had also understood that Mr. Pilloud in his earlier testimony had stated that on certain occasions, witnesses were present when Red Cross officials met with detainees.

(more)

The Chairman said the recordings of what Mr. Pilloud had earlier stated to the Committee would be consulted, in line with the remarks just made by Mr. Pilloud.

The Special Committee then went into closed session.

Statement by Gideon Weigert

Meeting on 1 May, the Special Committee first heard GIDEON WEIGERT, who said he lived in Jerusalem and was an Israeli national and a journalist.

He said he had begun his Arabic studies in 1939, graduating in such studies. He had been a correspondent with the Palestine Post (now the Jerusalem Post) from 1945 to 1948. From 1948 to 1967, he had continued his study of Arab questions, including the economic and social side, while continuing as a journalist.

Many people in Israel, he said, had followed with great interest the reports of the Committee's work. He had studied them carefully and had found they presented a shocking picture of willful killings, mass rape and pillage. He said he hoped to open the eyes of the Committee even at this late date to what was really going on. He said the reports carried by the world news agencies gave a picture "that is false, that is distorted".

He said the witnesses appeared to fall into two classes: refugees from the course of the fighting or emigrés coming out in the period immediately following the fighting. He said that every one of these had signed a statement saying that he was leaving on his own accord, with no pressure having been brought to bear. The second group, he said, were people expelled for acts of terrorism and sabotage or for encouraging such acts.

Mr. Weigert said the evidence presented to the Committee had been with the full consent, blessing and approval of the Arab countries. There had been, in his view, a common aim in besmirching Israel and the more this was done, the better the evidence.

The Chairman interrupted to say that he did not want witnesses commenting on the credibility of others.

The witness said he came with neither the approval "and surely not the blessing" of the Israel Government. He said he did not come to idolize the Israel Government, and in his writing he had praised the Government where necessary and criticized the Government where necessary.

(more)

He said he had spoken to hundreds of Arabs in the course of his work, had entered their homes and eaten and slept with them, in towns and villages and refugee camps. He said there had been rises in the standard of living of the Arabs in the occupied territories in the last three years, and he had statistics on this.

The witness said that in his evidence, he would take the Committee on a trip to the occupied territories.

The Chairman commented that the Committee would like to go themselves on such a trip, not necessarily in the company of the witness or anyone else. He said this was no reflection on the witness; he merely wished to make this comment.

The witness then read from a series of articles in the Israeli press, several of which had been written by him. He had quoted a number of people who, he said, were Arabs living in the occupied territories, in his articles. In each case, he added, they had had no objection to the publication of their names, and, in most cases, had agreed to their photographs being printed.

The articles referred to increased fishing catches by Arab fishermen; expanded handicraft industry; increased sales of cigarettes; large expansion of agriculture; changes from low-income crops, such as melons, to tobacco and cotton crops; and expansion of chocolate manufacture.

The witness said he would then sum up the evidence presented.

The Chairman said an assessment was not required. The Committee would make any assessment. Facts were required, not personal opinions.

The witness said he would strike out any personal opinions in what he had to say. He said he had not met any Arabs who wanted to "dance the national dance of Israel to its national hymn". But he had met thousands who wanted to co-operate in development and to join forces to exploit the present situation until there was some political solution.

He said production had increased by three times since 1967, and income and profits by four times.

Mr. Weigert quoted the Mayor of Nablus as stating in the Jerusalem Post of 1 January 1969 that King Hussein could never expect the West Bank to again be a ranch for himself or his men.

(more)

He said the Mayor of Hebron, on 27 April 1970, had said that the terrorists were giving the Israeli authorities reason to close the area and were deliberately trying to harm the population. The Mayor, the witness said, had stated that his people had been working for peace since 1967 and would not be diverted from that aim.

The witness quoted from the Arabic press in Israel and what he termed "the new areas" to show, he said, that there was full freedom of expression.

He also quoted Angie Brooks as saying she had found no complaints in the area and had seen only friendly relations and a smile on every face.

Questions and Answers

During the questioning, the witness began to weep, and the Chairman asked him if he would like time to compose himself.

The witness said he did not. He apologized for showing his emotions.

The Chairman asked if the witness was aware of the demolition of houses. The witness said he was.

The Chairman asked if the witness felt that the punishment was proportionate to the crime. The witness said the Chairman was now asking for an opinion when, before, he had said he only wanted facts.

The Chairman said he was only asking if a reasonable man would regard the punishment as proportionate. The witness said he did not know.

The Chairman said that much evidence had been presented to the Committee. It wanted to hear the other side of the story and therefore valued the presence of the witness. The Committee attached the highest importance to his appearance before the Committee, and he thanked the witness for coming.

The witness was asked if he had heard of Felice Langer, and he said he had not. He said he worked in the field and did not have time to see, hear or investigate everything.

In reply to questions on the judicial system, the witness said he did not know why the Jordan Supreme Court had been transferred from Jerusalem. He only knew that the judicial system operated and worked. He said Jordanian law applied in the West Bank. He was certain that the criminal law was the same as before.

(more)

Asked if he was aware that everything went before a military court, the witness said he was not aware of anything like that at all.

Asked if he knew any cases of pressure on Palestine lawyers to co-operate with the military authorities, or of expulsion for a refusal to co-operate, Mr. Weigert said his evidence was exactly the contrary. It was Jordan that threatened the lawyers if they co-operated. He knew of no case of expulsion for failure to co-operate.

As far as administrative detention was concerned, he said this had applied to Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs "in the pre-1967 border". He said the same regulations now applied in Gaza and the West Bank.

He said that in both Israel and the occupied territories, the case of every detainee came up every six months for review by a committee headed by a high court judge. Unless that committee approved of continued detention, he said the detaineed had to be released.

The witness was asked if he regarded the "unification" of Jerusalem as something affecting the human rights of the people of the occupied territories. He said he did, and the effect was beneficial in improving living standards.

To questions regarding "new settlements", the witness said that in Hebron, he knew of only one new group of housing units which were within the compound of the military government. There were some military settlements at special strategic points but except for the Golan Heights, as far as he knew, there was not kibbutzing in the occupied territories.

Asked whose land was being used for new settlements in the Golan Heights, he said he did not know. Asked if the land had once belonged to Arabs who had gone out of the area, Mr. Weigert said he would not be surprised.

The Chairman said the witness had said he had criticized the Israel Government when criticism was necessary. The witness said he had done this in his articles.

The Chairman asked for examples. The witness said that in his articles, he had quoted criticisms by Arabs.

After looking up clippings, the Chairman said there was not a single line of comment by the witness.

(more)

Statement by Louis Velleman

LOUIS VELLEMAN said he was a Dutch journalist, and he had twice visited the occupied territories. He had covered the 1967 war and stayed there until about 23 June. He had gone again in September 1969 for about two weeks.

He had been in the Golan Heights, Gaza Strip and the West Bank, he stated. He had gone back last September because of rumours of a new war and had spent the time visiting the occupied areas.

Mr. Velleman said he had started in September 1969 in the Gaza Strip. then went to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. He went next to the West Bank and then the Golan Heights.

He said he had heard the same story everywhere. The Arab population always began by saying that the occupation was illegal and the Israelis should go home.

Regarding the behaviour of the occupying authorities, he said the Arabs said the military forces behaved properly. The Mayor of Gaza, he said, recognized that bombs were thrown by what the Mayor called "underground forces", and he said this was the fault of the Israelis for occupying the area.

Concerning the blowing up of houses, he said there was no doubt that this was done regularly. The Tel Aviv Press Office gave out statistics on this. Decisions, however, were stated to be taken at the highest level on this, and not by local commanders. The decisions were taken practically by General Dayan himself, he added.

Mr. Velleman said the official figure was in the hundreds.

He said it was very easy to find Arabs who would say that they were tortured. However, he had no evidence of ary individual cases of torture, let alone a systematic policy of torture.

Some Israeli commanders admitted that some people might occasionally be kicked in the back or slapped in the face to get information. However, he did not regard this as torture.

Police forces all around the world did this, he went on. He had no illusions about police force behaviour anywhere, and he did not think the Israeli police were any better or worse than others, he said.

(more)

Mr. Velleman said that in Jerusalem, he was convinced that almost 100 per cent of the people in the Old City of Jerusalem would vote for an "open city". He said trade was booming. The economic situation had changed so much in the Old City that he believed that people, if only because of the tourist trade, would not want to go back to the previous situation.

Everyone he had talked to in the Old City said the Israelis were not too bad, in view of the economic situation, he stated. In the other occupied territories, he said the inhabitants said they wanted the Israelis to leave.

The witness said he had refused any Israeli help with regard to transport or an armed guard in order to be as free as possible in talking to people.

He said that, on the whole, the Arabs he had spoken to did not think the Israelis were behaving too badly.

He had lived through the German Occupation, he continued, and there was no comparison between that and the Israli occupation which, on such a comparison, might even be termed "amateurish".

Mr. Velleman said anybody who was too difficult was politely asked to go to Jordan.

On the Allenby Bridge, he said there was heavy traffic. Any Arab who would like to go from the West Bank to the East Bank could do so, in his opinion.

The witness said the Israelis always made sure that the houses were evacuated before the houses were demolished. He said they had told him they paid damages to those whose houses were demolished when it was shown that they were not responsible for the terrorism. He said he had seen the files on this in Israel.

In reply to a question, he said he could not tell if the compensation was adequate. He said there was not the slightest evidence of people being killed while in houses that were demolished.

There was not even a rumour of such practices, he added.

The Chairman said some witnesses had told the Committee that people were buried in the rubble of demolished houses.

The witness said there was a difference between a neutral journalist going to the area and a committee such as the present Committee to which witnesses were sent to testify.

(more)

The Chairman said the trouble was that there were also two kinds of neutral journalists appearing before the Committee. Some said one thing about conditions in the occupied territories, and others said other things.

The witness said he knew of no occupied area that allowed journalists to travel so freely. If there were cases of people being blown up in their houses, the international press would know. He said that journalists were always present at least on the day after the demolitions.

The witness said, in reply to a question, that he had not interviewed Arabs outside the occupied territories in Arab countries who had left the occupied territories.

Apart from Mr. Hodgkin, Foreign Editor of the London Times, he said all journalists he knew had come to the same conclusions as his.

The Chairman asked whether the underground movement in the Netherlands under the Germans could be called "terrorist".

He said the Dutch underground never threw bombs into market places or killed their own people. This is what Fateh did, he asserted. The Dutch underground had never been "terrorist", he said. Fateh might become a real underground movement eventually, he added, because they had a case.

The Chairman said that at one point, the witness had spoken of "tit-for-tat". Was there any difference regarding Israeli-occupied territories and German occupation as a policy in this regard.

The witness said there was no comparison. There was no comparison between nazi Germany and what was happening in the Middle East. He was more worried, he said, about what was happening "in Greece, communist China and Russia" than in the Middle East.

He said the Israeli prisons were all open to journalists.

In reply to questions, he said he had not tried to find out what was happening in any prison. He said he had not heard of the Sarafand detention camp.

In reply to further questions, he said that in the two weeks following the June 1967 war, when he was there, "the Israelis behaved like angels".

He said he was not aware of a Red Cross report stating that in August 1967, the Arabs were suffering great hardship in Gaza.

* *** *

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. The main purpose of the Government in presenting the Bill of the Administrative Provisions Law is to normalize the economic and civic life within the area where Israel law has been applied (hereinafter referred to as "the Area").

2. The Bill contains a number of ameliorative measures, among which are the following:

(a) With the application of Israel law to the Area, the Absentees' Property Law, 1950, has also gone into effect. The operation of the latter Law has created a situation in which residents of the Area are absentees and their property is considered as absentees' property. This is the factual and legal position, although the administration has done all that it can within the limits of the existing law to enable residents of the Area to continue to go about their business without hindrance or restriction. Without amendment of the law, it is virtually impossible for the residents of the Area to deal normally with their property or to carry on commercial activities.

In order to avoid the continuation of this irrational situation, the Bill provides that any person who on June 28, 1967 was resident in the Area shall not be deemed to be an absentee with regard to property of his situated in the Area.

(b) The Bill lays down that the Absentees' Property Law shall not apply to the Holy Places situated in the Area. A Holy Place is not to be treated as absentees' property even if the trustees thereof have fled

to Amman. This provision enables the local representative of the absent trustees to give full protection to such Holy Place against any trespassers or intruders.

(c) Sections 6 to 12 of the Bill ensure the continuation of the activities of companies and other associations such as partnerships and cooperative societies.

The present situation is that companies and associations which were registered and operated in accordance with Jordanian law continue to operate in fact even after the application of Israel law, though without legal warrant. Clearly the legal basis for the existence of these companies and associations was taken from them with the application of Israel law to the Area and in point of law alone they no longer exist. To avoid muddle which may embarrass altogether the actual existence of such companies and associations and to remove hardship and injury to parties involved in dealings with such bodies, the Bill secures the active and continued legal existence of companies and associations which existed in the Area on the day which an Order applying Israel law came into effect.

The Bill creates a transitional period of three months which will enable shareholders and directors to decide upon the future conduct and operation of their companies. It also ensures that a director or member who is in the Area shall not be declared an absentee in respect of the assets of the company situated in the Area. The concern of the legislature is, however, not limited to the transitional period alone. The Bill sets up proper machinery to enable the members and directors to convert their companies or associations into companies

and associations registered in Israel. The new companies or new associations will have the right to carry on all such types of business and economic activity that their predecessors were permitted to do previously under Jordanian law and will have equal status in all respects with other Israel companies.

(d) Section 13 of the Bill assures that a resident of the Area, who is engaged in a profession, trade or other occupation which requires a licence under Israel law, shall be able to continue to carry on such occupation until receipt of a licence under Israel law, which will be granted him even if the applicant does not fulfil all the conditions of personal qualification prescribed by Israel law.

Here, the aim is prominently to afford legal recognition to a given state of affairs, even if that is not in accord with the requirements of Israel law. To mention but two examples of how the Bill will operate. Under Israel law, only a qualified person may own a pharmacy, but where a pharmacy in the Area is now owned by an unqualified person, he will nonetheless be allowed to continue to be the owner. Again, under Israel law, the licensing authorities may set minimum requirements as to space of business premises and refuse licences to businesses which do not comply with the standards so laid down. Here also licences will be granted to existing businesses notwithstanding non-compliance with such standards. Thus it may be claimed that this section embodies clear preferential treatment of residents of the Area with the object of facilitating easy passage and smooth adaptation to economic life.

(e) A similar aim is to be found in section 14 of the Bill which is

intended to enable lawyers and judges who previously practised or who served in the Area to be members of the Israel Chamber of Advocates and thus enable them to continue their professional pursuits as lawyers throughout Israel without any examinations, either in Israel Law or in the Hebrew language.

(f) Section 15 of the Bill enables a resident of the Area who on the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law had lawful rights in a patent, design or trade-mark, to register these rights in accordance with Israel law within three months from the date of the commencement of the Law and his application for registration will be deemed to have been made on the day he first made his application to register these rights in Jordan.

(g) Section 16 of the Bill ensures the continuation of building works begun under plans and licences issued by the Jordanian authorities before the application of Israel law to the Area. These licences are deemed building permits issued under Israel law. The power of the district planning and building commissions to revoke permits has been curtailed with regard to such licences, setting a time limit of three months from the date of commencement of the Law.

3. Section 17 of the Bill provides for the continuation of legal proceedings commenced in the former courts of the Area, thus enabling litigants to go on with pending cases and to continue with the execution of unsatisfied judgments given by Jordanian courts.

4. Section 5 of the Bill regulates the restoral of Jewish property which was vested following the occupation of Eastern Jerusalem by Jordan in the custodian of enemy property or in some other Jordanian agency. Upon due application this

property will pass under the Bill to the Administrator General who on his part will transfer it to such person who was the owner thereof before it came into the hands of the Jordanian custodian of enemy property or other like agency.

It should be emphasized that the Bill does not prejudice third party rights in property lawfully acquired from the Jordanian custodian of enemy property. In other words, a resident of the area, who during the period of Jordanian rule acquired from the custodian of enemy property for consideration any property which before it became vested in such custodian was Jewish property, will not be adversely affected by this Bill and his rights in the property will remain as they were hitherto. By way of example, a resident of the Area, who purchased a house in the area from the Jordanian custodian will be recognized as the lawful owner thereof and his title will be protected against any claim that the previous Jewish owner may put up. If this provision is not enacted the Jewish owner may claim that the sale by the Jordanian custodian was void ab initio.

5. This Bill responds to the express wishes and requests of the inhabitants that their rights and activities be given legal recognition. It constitutes the formal expression of the policy of Israel to provide for all protection of rights under the rule of law and to facilitate the lawful pursuit of all civil activities.

Amended 5729-1969

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS LAW, 1968

Definitions.

1. In this Law -

"Order applying the law" means an Order under section 11B of the Law and Administration Ordinance, 1948[1];

"Area of Application" of an Order applying the law, means the area prescribed in that Order.

Non-application of the Absentees' Property Law, 1950 to the Holy Places.

2. The Absentees' Property Law, 1950[2], shall not, from the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law, apply to the Holy Places situated in the area of application.

Revocation of absentee status in respect of certain property.

3. Any person who on the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law is in the area of its application and was a resident there, shall not be deemed an absentee within the meaning of the Absentees' Property Law, 1950, in respect of property situate in that area.

Plea of Enemy Status.

4. No court or tribunal shall, in any civil matter, entertain a plea that a particular person, who was a resident in the area of application of an Order applying the law is an enemy unless the Attorney-General of the Government or his representative so pleads.

Release of vested immovable property.

5. (a) From the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law there shall be vested in the Administrator General, so that he shall deal therewith as hereafter in this section provided, immovable property situated in the area of application of the Order, which before the area

passed into the control of the Israel Defence Forces was vested in a person appointed by the State authorities in actual occupation of that area as custodian of enemy property or as an officer with like title, or which that person transferred to any of the authorities of that State or to a body which was under the control of such authorities.

(b) The Administrator General shall by a certificate under his hand release immovable property as aforesaid in subsection (a) to whomever was its owner before it vested in the custodian or officer as aforesaid in subsection (a) or to the successor of such owner upon their application; so long as the immovable property has not been released the Administrator General shall deal therewith as he may have dealt with the immovable property of a missing person under the Administrator General Ordinance, 1944[3], and the provisions of that Ordinance shall apply for the purpose of this section.

(c) Where such immovable property included a public building erected after it was vested in the custodian or officer as aforesaid in subsection (a) and the immovable property was acquired under the Land (Acquisition for Public Purposes) Ordinance, 1943[4], soon after its release in accordance with subsection (b), the compensation payable in respect of such acquisition shall be calculated according to the value of the land alone.

Companies - continuation of activity.

6. Where a company in the area of application had its principal place of business immediately before the commencement of an Order applying the law and had been established in accordance with the law in force in that area, it may, notwithstanding any provision of the Companies' Ordinance(5) or of the Absentees' Property Law, 1950, continue its activities until the expiration of three months from the date of the commencement of the Order or from the date of the commencement of this Law, or until the court shall give judgment upon an application made under section 9, whichever is the later.

Companies - exemption from absentee status.

7. Any director or member of a company referred to in section 6 who on the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law is in the area of its application and was a resident there, shall not be deemed an absentee in respect of the assets of the company which is situated in that area or in respect of his rights as a member of the company, or in respect of the activities of the company under section 6 or section 9.

Companies - registration of charges.

8. Where a company referred to in section 6 gives a mortgage or charge on its assets, the provisions of section 127 of the Companies Ordinance shall apply with regard to the registration of the mortgage or charge.

Companies - transfer of assets and liabilities to an Israel company.

9. (a) Where a company referred to in section 6 has within three months from the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law or from the date of the commencement of this Law, whichever is the later, come to an arrangement

with a company registered in Israel for the transfer to the latter of its assets and liabilities situated in Israel, the company registered in Israel may, within three months from the date of the execution of the documents of the arrangement, apply by way of motion to the District Court of Jerusalem for an order confirming the arrangement.

(b) Notice of the filing of an application under subsection (a) and of the date of its hearing shall be published in the Official Gazette in the form prescribed by the court.

(c) Subsections (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (10) and (12) of section 119A of the Companies Ordinance shall mutatis mutandis apply to an arrangement under this section.

Partnerships.

10. The provisions of sections 6 to 9 shall mutatis mutandis apply also to partnerships.

Cooperative Societies - continuation of activity.

11. (a) Where a cooperative society had it s principal place of business in the area of application of the law immediately before the commencement of an Order applying the law and had been established in accordance with the law in force in that area, it may - notwithstanding any provision of the Cooperative Societies Ordinance[6] or of the Absentees' Property Law, 1950 - continue its

Retrospective.

Indemnity - Contingent liability.

activities until the expiration of six months from the date of the commencement of the Order or from the date of the commencement of this Law, or until it is registered under the provisions of section 12(a), whichever is the later.

(b) The provisions of sections 7 and 8 shall mutatis mutandis apply also to a cooperative society.

Cooperative Societies - transfer of assets and liabilities to an Israel Society.

12. (a) The Minister of Labour may, by general or special Order, prescribe provisions for the registration of a cooperative society referred to in section 11, including provisions with regard to its rules, membership and organs; and a society registered in accordance with such Order shall for all purposes be deemed to have been registered under the Cooperative Societies Ordinance, and the provisions of the Ordinance and of the Regulations made thereunder shall apply to every matter not prescribed by the provisions of the Order.

(b) The Registrar of Cooperative Societies may make arrangements with regard to the transfer of the assets and liabilities of a society referred to in section 11 to a society registered under subsection (a) and he may apply by way of motion to the District Court of Jerusalem for an order confirming the arrangement; the provisions of section 9(b) and (c) shall mutatis mutandis apply also for the purpose of this section.

Occupational licences.

13. (a) Any resident of an area of application, who shortly before the commencement of an Order applying the law was engaged in a profession, trade or other occupation in accordance with the law that had been in force in that area and such occupation requires a licence under an Israel enactment, may pursue his occupation until receiving a licence under the Israel enactment but not for longer than six months after the date of the commencement of the Order or after the date of the commencement of this law, whichever is the later.

(b) A licence may be given to a resident referred to in subsection (a) even if he does not satisfy a condition of personal qualification prescribed by the enactment.

(c) Where the grant of such licence was under Israel enactment subject to conditions affecting the place of the occupation, the Minister charged with the implementation of that enactment may make regulations with regard to persons to whom subsection (a) applies, which shall include concessions, either for a given period or permanently, in respect of the place of their occupation before the commencement of the Order applying the law; and he may prescribe in these Regulations conditions for granting the licence; so long as such Regulations have not been made, the

authority competent to grant the licence may determine such concessions as part of the conditions of the licence.

(d) This section shall not apply to a licence under the Firearms Law, 1949,[7] or under the Explosives Law, 1954,[8].

Advocates.

14. (a) A resident in the area of application of an Order applying the law, who immediately before the commencement of the Order served in that area as a judge of a civil court or acted as an advocate there, shall become a member of the Chamber of Advocates from the date of the commencement of the Order or from date of the commencement of this Law, whichever is the later.

(b) The Minister of Justice shall publish in the Official Gazette the names of the persons to whom subsection (a) applies.

(c) The Minister of Justice may by regulations prescribe the conditions, including concessions, for obtaining membership of the Chamber of Advocates in respect of an Israel resident who at any time before the commencement of this Law served as a judge of a civil court in any part of Palestine to which an Order applying the law has not been applied or acted as an advocate there.

(d) The Minister of Justice may by regulations prescribe the conditions, including concessions, for obtaining membership of the Chamber of Advocates in respect of an Israel

resident who was a resident of an area of application of an Order applying the law immediately before the commencement thereof and was qualified to be an advocate but did not practice as an advocate or was a clerk under service in such area but had not yet completed his period of qualifying service.

Registration of rights in patents and designs.

15. Any person who on the date of the commencement of an Order applying the law possessed in the area of application a registered right of ownership in a patent, design or trade mark, or before that had applied to have such rights registered, may within three months from the date of commencement of the Order or from the date of commencement of this Law, whichever is the later, apply to register his rights under Israel law; and he shall be deemed to have made the application for registration of the rights under Israel law on the date when he first applied for registration of those rights.

Continuation of building works.

16. (a) Where the foundations of a building have been completed in accordance with a building licence issued under the law which had been in force in the area of application of an Order applying the law before its commencement, the owner of the licence, who within a year from the date of commencement of the Order or from the date of commencement of this Law, whichever is the later, has served notice of his intention to continue the building works, is entitled to receive a

building permit under Israel law; a permit under this section shall be exempt from the payment of a fee.

(b) The District Planning and Building Commission may, within three months from the date of the grant of a permit under subsection (a) and after giving the owner of the permit reasonable opportunity to present his case, cancel the permit for the reasons for which an application for a building permit on that site may be refused, and it may suspend the permit pending decision with regard to its cancellation.

Continuity of legal proceedings etc.

17. The Minister of Justice may by regulations, either generally or for a particular class of matters, prescribe provisions in the following matters -

(1) which courts shall hear cases that immediately before the commencement of an Order applying the law were pending in a court in the area of application and the procedure in those cases;

(2) the enforcement and execution by the courts and execution offices of final judgments and other orders and decisions given before the commencement of an Order applying the law by a court whose area of jurisdiction included the area of application of the Order;

(3) recognition and certification of documents issued or certified before the commencement of an Order applying

the law by an authority in the area of application of that Order.

Regulations.

18. Each Minister charged with the implementation of a law to which any provision of this Law relates, may make regulations for the implementation of that provision, and he may in those regulations prescribe complementary provisions, including the extension of periods, correlation of fees and exemption therefrom.

The law is an authority in the case of application of

Tata Sons.

Terminations. 12. Such failure is also in violation of a law so

which may be taken of the law in question. The Tata Trusteeship for

the termination of this matter, and the rule in Tata

Industries provides contemporary conditions, including the

presence of a Tata, determination of law and complete termination.

(1) 1 Laws of the State of Israel (Official English translation; hereafter referred to as "LSI") p. 7.

(2) 4 LSI, p. 68

(3) 1944 Palestine Gazette, Supp. 1, p. 151

(4) 1943 Palestine Gazette, Supp. 1, p. 44

(5) 1 Laws of Palestine (Drayton) p. 161

(6) 1 Laws of Palestine (Drayton) p. 360

(7) 3 LSI, p. 61

(8) 8 LSI, p. 57

LAW AND ADMINISTRATION (AMENDMENT NO. 11) LAW, 1967

Addition of section 11B.

1. In the Law and Administration Ordinance, 1948, the following section shall be added after section 11A:

"Application of the law.

11B. The law, jurisdiction and administration of the State shall apply in every area of Eretz-Israel which the Government has by Order prescribed".

Commencement.

2. This Law shall commence on the day it is passed by the Knesset.

Levi Eshkol
Prime Minister

Ya'acov Shimshon Shapiro
Minister of Justice

Shneur Zalman Shazar
President of the State

LAW AND ADMINISTRATION ORDINANCE, 1948

Order Prescribing Areas

By virtue of its powers under section 11B of the Law and Administration Ordinance, 1948, and by virtue of its other powers under any other law, the Government orders as follows:

Prescription of area.

1. The area of Eretz-Israel described in the Schedule is hereby prescribed as an area in which the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State apply.

Title.

2. This Order shall be called "Law and Administration (No. 1) Order, 1967".

SCHEDULE

[This Schedule sets out the area above referred to.]

June 28, 1967.

Yaël Uzai
Government Secretary

Witnesses before the Special Committee to investigate Israeli practices affecting human rights in occupied territories.

Witness number	N a m e	D a t e	Press Release
	LONDON (9 witnesses)		
1.	Mr. Adams (Information Director of the Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding(CAABU) - a journalist for The Guardian of the UK in 1968-69.	1 April 1970	HR/483
2.	Mr. Reddaway (Administration Director of CAABU) Former Deputy-Commissioner of the UNRWA from June 1967 to August 1968. Held his post in UNRWA from 1960-68.	" "	"
3.	Miss Manuela Sykes (Jerusalem Committee)	2 April 1970	HR/484
4.	Miss Grania Birkett (Secretary og the Council for the CAABU.	" "	"
5.	Mosho Machover - (Said to be Israeli)	" "	"
6.	Abraham Heilbronn " " "	" "	"
7.	Christopher Mayhew (Member of Parliament)	3/4 April "	HR/487
8.	Mrs. Leila Mantoura (Of Palestinian origin and now a British subject)	"" "	"
9.	Richard Slotover (22-year old British law student)	" "	"
	BEIRUT (8 witnesses)		
10.	Mr. George Dib (Assistant Professor at Beirut University and Advisor to the Institute for Palestine Studies).	6 April 1970	HR/489
11.	Ibrahim Al Abid (Assistant to the Director of the Palestine Research Centre)	7 April 1970	HR/490
12.	Halim Barakat) (Professors in the Department of		
13.	Peter Dodd) Sociology and Anthropology of the American University in Beirut)	" "	"
14.	Ahmed Khalifa (Describer as a former prisoner who left the occupied territories this year).	" "	"
15.	Mrs. Nimate Oueida - (Described as Palestine refugee)	" "	"
16.	Mr. Talat El Tamimi (Described a s Palestine refugee)	8 April 1970	HR/492
17.	Mr. Yousef Sayegh -(Palestinian refugee and now Professor of Economics at American University in Beirut).	" "	"

Witness number	Name	Date	Press Release
	DAMASCUS		
18.	Mr. Sedaddin Kamal (Doorkeeper and messenger at the Ministry of Public Works, Kuneitra)	9 April 1970	HR/496
19.	Mr. Mohamedkheir Fayezid Eid (Responsible for hiring Mr. Kamal in Kuneitra)	"	"
20.	Mrs. Tayme Mandou Khasabe (Peasant farmer from Djeraba)"	"	"
21.	Mrs. Mandou Yussef Djasem (20-year villager from Mashta)		
22.	Mr. Hussein Maarouk (A Palestinian from Kalamer)	10/11 "	HR/499
23.	Mr. Ahmad Dawwas (A Syrian from Massakie)	" "	"
24.	Mr. Muhammed Nassif (Mukhtar of Hafar)	" "	"
25.	Mr. Musa Ersan (A Syriam from Machta)	" "	"
26.	Mr. Ali Diben (A Syrian from Machta)	" "	"
27.	Miss Nadwa Nouri ( )(First Aid centre in Naab)	" "	"
28.	Mr. Mughrabi Abdul) Joint statement		
29.	Mr. Ahman Rajab)		
30.	Mr. Hamdem Khatib (A villager from Zaoura)	" "	"
31.	Mr. Abdul Rahman Tomeh (A villager from Zaoura)	" "	"
32.	Mrs. Najat Zintabi (From Kuneitra)	" "	"
33.	Mr. Sabri Abdul Khader (From Kuneitra)	" "	"
34.	Mr. Asad Shukairi (From Khoushnieh)	" "	"
35.	Mr. Abdulazz Dinab Radhi (From Sbitta)	" "	"
36.	Mr. Toussef Khaled Awad (Syrians) Heard together	12 April 1970	HR/501
37.	Mr. Ahmed Shihab Salibi ")	" " "	"
38.	Mr. Hasan Muhammed Achkar ")	" " "	"
39.	Mr. Mubarak Awad Ibrahim (A villager from Nassriye) "	" "	"
40.	Mr. Mahmoud Kasem Fa'ouri (A villager from Kfarharab)	" "	"
41.	Mr. Muhammed Ahmed Ibrahim (A villager from Darbashiyya)	" "	"
42.	Mr. Muhammed Djasem Abou-Lail (A villager from Bteha)	" "	"
43.	Mr. Mahmoud Khuneifis (A villager from Sanaber)	" "	"

Mr. Shawkat Shatti of the Syrian Red Crescent and Mr. Muwaffakiddin Kuzbari of the Human Rights League in Syria presented a number of documents to the Committee which were accepted as a part of the documentation of the Committee.

Witness number	N a m e	D a t e	Press Release
	XXXXX AMMAN(JORDAN)		
44.	Anton A.Atalla (A Member of the Upper House of the Parliament of Jordan, General Manager in Jordan of the Arab Land Bank and a former Forein Minister of Jordan).	15 April 1970	HR/503
45.	Abdul Hamid Sayegh (Described as the Head of the Islamic Courts of Jerusalem and Amman)	"	"
46.	Nadim Zarou (Said he was the Major of Ramallah before and after the occupation)	"	"
47.	N.J. Simaan (Roman Catholic Bishop and Vicar-General of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem)	"	"
48.	Archbishop Diodoros of the Greek Orthodox Church	"	"
49.	Constantine Karamash (A parish priest of the Greek Orthodox Church in Amman).	"	"
50.	Nagib El Ahmed (A former Deputy of the Jordanian Parliament from Jenin)	16 April 1970	HR/504
51.	Salah Anantawi(From Nablus and was now Secretary of the Deportees Section of the Jerusalem Liberation Committee)	"	"
52.	Ragheb Aburas (From Bireh of Ramallah District)	"	"
53.	Abu Ras	"	"
54.	Ahmad Abu Quor of Jordanian Red Crescent	"	"
55.	Rouhi El Khatib (Siad he was Majot of Jerusalem but now banished and living in Amman)	"	"
56.	Ahmad Al Hadmi (Said he had come to the East Bank this month on a permit issued by Israeli authorities)	17 April 1970	HR/505
57.	Youssef Hafez Salahat(18-year old student from Karami)	"	"
58.	Ghazi Sauki of the Palestine Red Crescent Society	"	"
59.	Salim Khalil Kharsa (Formerly of Ramallah)	"	"
60.	Khalil Soubi Abu Shawish (formerly of the Rafah refugee camp)	"	"
61.	Ibrahim Abeid Abu Suhaiban (Of a refugee camp)	"	"
62.	Fayez Abeid Abu Suhaiban(13-year brother of the a/m)	"	"
63.	Taysir Nabulsi (Of the Palestine Liberation Organization)	"	"
64.	Yacoub Alabeidi	"	"

Witness number	N a m e	D a t e	Press Release
	AMMAN (contd)		
65.	Sabri Amara	17 April 1970	HR/505(ctd
66/67	Ismael Abu Mayala and his wife Abla Tahha	"	"
68.	Munir Abdallah Ghanam(Of the Palestine Liberation Front)	18 April 1970	HR/507
69.	Othaman Abdulhadi El Araj (From Walhjej)	"	"
70.	Najeh Mohammed Issa Khatab (Of Karameh)	"	"
71.	Abdel Rahim Saleh El Majthuba(Said to be Mukhtar of Yalo village)	"	"
72.	Mohammed F. Maraqa(From Jericho and his 6-year	"	"
73.	Soher Maraqa dauther)	"	"
74.	Seifiddin Ismail Abdel Fattah Tayem (From Nuba)	"	"
75.	Suleiman Mohammed Sheikh Eid (From Gaza)	"	"
	CAIRO (UAR)		
76.	Dr. Kamal Malak Gobrial (A surgeon)	22 April 1970	HR/508
78.	Mohammed Derbas (A civilian hospital aid)	"	"
79.	Mrs. Hekmat El-Sayed Ahmed Eldib(An Inspector of the Ministry of Education)	"	"
80.	Dr. Onsi Serga (A doctor at El Arish Hospital)	"	"
81.	Dr.Shehata Habib (Director Of Gaza Hospital)	"	"
82.	Miss Eisha Awad Hagazi (From El Arish)	"	"
83.	Youssef Darwish(Said to be a Secretary of the International Ass. of Democratic Lawyers)	"	"
84.	Miss Kamilia Kamel Elzerbawi)Appeared together	"	"
85.	Mrs. Menaawer Soliman Elzerbawi)	"	"
86.	Dr. Mahmoud Soliman Elbark (A doctor)	"	"
87.	Mohamed Nader Lotfi (Director of Social Affairs at El Arish)	"	"

Witness number	Name	Date	Press Releases
	CAIRO (UAR) contd.		
88.	Handi El Khalili (Said to be a lawyer from El Arish)	23 April 70	HR/509
89.	Mansi Selma Elgar (Said to be a police sergeant at El Arish)	"	"
90.	Seliman El Yamani (Said to be a Sheikh of tribe)	"	"
91.	Ismael Zikry (A Customs official from El Arish)	"	"
92.	Moheb Hassan Hussein (15-year old son of a merchant still in El Arish)	"	"
93.	Tewfik Hassan Wasfi (A Counsellor in the Arab League office)	"	"
94.	Ahmed Abdullah El Malardi (Fisherman from El Arish)	"	"
95.	Abdel Rohum El Damrani (The headmaster of an El Arish school)	"	"
96.	Rabei A. El Sherif (From El Arish)	"	"
97.	Mohammed Shhaben El Kasali (The Sheikh of a tribe called Fawakhribn)	"	"
	Dr. Kamal Malak Govrial (A surgeon from El Arish Hospital until 16 Sept.1969) (See No. 76)	"	"
98.	Soliman Fisal Abdel Malek (A Member of the Parliament of the UAR representing the Sinai)	24 April	HR/510
99.	Salem Aly El Hersh (A Sheikh of the Bayadeh tribe)	"	"
100.	Mrs. Manay Salama Elfar (From El Arish)	"	"
101.	Abdel Wahab Hussein El Sherif (From El Arish)	"	"
102.	Ismail Rashed Yakub (A fisherman)	"	"
103.	Miss Hoda El Abd El Hessy (From Gaza)	"	"
104.	Mohammed El Abd El Hessy (The brother of the above)	"	"
105.	Mrs. Chalia Mohammed Housayen (Of Kantara)	"	"
106.	Mohammed Salem Mohammed Hassan (A fisherman)	"	"
107.	Mrs. Sobha Soliman Emira (Of Bir El Abd)	"	"
108.	Mrs Narges Mohammed Ibrahim (Of El Arish)	25 April 70	HR/511
109.	El Yemani Ahmed Hassan (Of El Arish)	"	"
110.	Deif Alla Ali Koulieb (From Rammanah)	"	"
111.	Abdulla Gabril Elbeid (A school teacher from El Arish)	"	"
112.	Saleh Eish Ibrahim (From Nagilam)	"	"

Witness number	N A M E	Date	From Relation
	CAIRO (UAR) contd.		
113.	Moussa El Jayoussi (A lawyer from Nablus)	25 April 70	HR/511 (ex
114.	Nabel Omar Abdel Samad Kandil (Private in UAR Army	"	"
115.	Mohammed Gad Ahmed El Saed " in 1967) "	"	"
116.	Said Ali Abdel Ghane " " "	"	"
117.	Mohammed Abdu Is Sayed Abd " " "	"	"
118.	Sheikh Souliman Moussi Ibrahim (Beir El Abd)	"	"
119.	Darwish Mustafa Elfar (Geological surveyor in Sinai)	27 April 70	HR/512
120.	Gamal Hassan Ayesh (Teacher in government secondary school) Gaza	"	"
121.	Ezzedding Foda (Appearing as the Secretary-General of the Egyptian Society for International Law)	"	"
122.	Fayez Sayegh (Representative of Kuwait Government appearing at its request)	"	"
	GENEVA		
123.	Mr. Pilloud (International Committee of the Red Cross)	1 May	HR/513 & Corr
	Mr. Pilloud " " " " " "	2 May	HR/515
124.	Mr. Gideon Weigart (Israeli journalist from Jerusalem)	"	"
125.	Mr. Louis Velleman (A Dutch journalist)	"	"
	NEW YORK		
126.	Mr. Joseph Abileah(Israeli citizen; A member of the Committee of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights.)	12 June 70	HR/520 & HR/522

NO

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/483
2 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN LONDON

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories began its hearings in London on 1 April, hearing evidence from Michael Adams and John Reddaway.

Mr. Adams, now Information Director of the Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding (CAABU), gave evidence of his experience in the occupied territories as a journalist, primarily for The Guardian of the United Kingdom, in 1968 and 1969.

Mr. Reddaway, now Administration Director of CAABU, gave evidence on his experiences in the occupied territories as the Deputy-Commissioner of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), from June 1967 to August 1968. Mr. Reddaway held his UNRWA post from 1960 to 1968.

Mr. Adams said that he spent about three weeks in Gaza in January 1968 and witnessed curfews imposed on UNRWA refugee camps lasting more than five days at a time, creating conditions affecting food and water supplies worse than anything he had experienced in four years as a prisoner of war in a German prison camp. These, he said, were part of collective punishments in a standard of practice designed to cow the population, particularly women, and to create a state of anxiety and shock to intimidate the refugees to leave the occupied territories.

(more)

He said that he went back to the occupied territories for a day in December 1969 and saw the results of the destruction of Halhul, where houses had been demolished in an area 100 metres long by 60 metres wide, with all Arab property in the houses bulldozed under the rubble. Probably 85 houses and 250 people were affected.

Mr. Adams said that the Israeli intimidation policy had now proven a failure since the refugees were now determined to stay, in contrast to the exodus after the June 1967 war.

He said that the Israelis had clearly had security fears, but the reprisals were taken against groups without any possibility of knowledge that particular individuals were involved in action against the Israeli occupation.

The Israelis stated that villages were destroyed for strategic reasons, but the fact was that the land of the area was given over for Israeli settlements. Compensation was only given in Jerusalem. Compensation in villages was minimal, if at all.

He had seen refugees with cigarette burns and razor slashes on their bodies, asserted to be inflicted during Israeli interrogations.

Since, six months after the 1967 fighting, the Arabs were leaving the occupied territories at a rate of 250 a day something had been clearly wrong, he stated. "In four years as a prisoner of war, I never experienced anything as harsh as that inflicted on the women and children in Gaza," he asserted. Water was available only one hour a day for women with young children, he added.

Mr. Adams said that the refugees were now experiencing educational problems. While the Israelis sometimes had had reason to remove books which had hostile and abusive material about them, these books had either never been replaced or had been replaced by text-books carrying such phrases as: "I am an Israeli citizien."

Mr. Reddaway said that, at Rafah, it had been alleged by the refugees that dwellings had been destroyed in a reprisal, at 4:30 in the morning one day in 1967. After the cease-fire was in effect, while the inhabitants were asleep, and that between 30 and 40 people had been killed as a result.

(more)

At a later date, he said that, under UNRWA supervision, 23 bodies of men, women and children had been exhumed.

Comparing the situation with his experiences in the colonial administration in Cyprus during what, he said, was the height of EOKA terrorism, he said that, if 23 deaths had occurred in such circumstances as that at Rafah, he was certain "heads would have rolled". The Governor would probably have had to resign, the local military commander would have been sacked and, maybe, even a Minister in London would have been forced to resign.

He said that, as far as Israel was concerned, the deaths were "a non-event". However, UNRWA had a record on file of the exhumation.

Asked if it was possible to have this report released, he said that he did not know; that was a question for the Secretary-General who had a copy and the UNRWA Commissioner-General.

Mr. Reddaway said that, no doubt, there had been frequent grenade-throwing and shots at Israeli forces, but his experience had been that "the scale of reprisals was altogether out of proportion".

He said that the exodus had continued for months after the war, and he thought that 35,000 people had left Gaza after the cease-fire. Continuing harassment by the Israeli military forces had been a factor in causing the people to leave.

He said that nobody could say why the Israelis had followed such a policy and, no doubt, security was a factor. However, he had no doubt that there had also been "a deliberate policy of instigating people to flee".

Asked whether the demolitions had been necessary for security reasons, he said: "Certainly not." He added: "They seemed to me to be senseless and well-calculated to produce the exact opposite."

Mr. Reddaway said that the Israelis had followed a Jekyll and Hyde policy. At times, they desired to do their humanitarian best in difficult circumstances; yet, at other times they took "an extremely harsh approach to the difficult task they had".

In Israel, the resistance movement which now existed in the occupied territories was, in part, at least the outcome of the misguided policies of the Israelis. The penalties imposed against "infiltrators" who, he said, were actually people trying to return to their homes in the summer of 1967, had been very severe.

(more)

Mr. Reddaway said that, after the 1967 war, there had been looting of UNEF equipment at Rafah, which, it had been agreed, was to be used for the relief of the refugees. He himself had seen that this was highly organized by the Israeli military authorities and was not the work of some uncontrolled mob.

He said that, out of over 150,000 people who had applied in 1967 to return to the areas they had fled, only 14,000 had been allowed back. To him, this appeared to be the turning point in the whole deterioration of the Middle East situation.

He said that, with the shock of war, there had been a brief hope for a political settlement, but the "disastrous decision" by Israel not to allow the refugees to return had led to a reversion to the intransigence and extremism which had characterized both sides before the war.

Regarding a future role for the United Nations regarding the occupied territories, Mr. Reddaway said he had always felt very strongly that the most effective protection for the population was some mechanism for bringing abuses before world public opinion. There was certainly a United Nations role to be played there.

However, if this was to be done, it must be adequately staffed and equipped. It had not been practical to send Mr. Gussing and one secretary to the area and expect him to inquire into all the specifics and details of the many allegations.

* *** *

20

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA — NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/484
3 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN LONDON

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories continued its hearings in London on 2 April, hearing witnesses in both closed and open sessions.

The witnesses heard on 2 April were the following: Miss Manuela Sykes of the Jerusalem Committee; Miss Grania Birkett, Secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding (CAABU); and Moshe Machover and Abraham Heilbronn, both of whom said they were Israeli citizens.

All witnesses, as those on 1 April, made the following solemn declaration before giving evidence: "I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I will speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

The Committee is scheduled to hold further hearings in London on 3 April, in both private and public sessions, before proceeding to Beirut.

Evidence Given to Committee

The first witness on 2 April, Miss Sykes, who said she had been to the area herself, stated that, in order to get evidence, her Committee had to send people in under some kind of cover, such as being a tourist. Her organization would continue to do this and make whatever evidence it could obtain available to world public opinion.

Miss Sykes said that, while it was possible to visit the prisons, the Israelis denied any access to the detention camps where most allegations of torture came from.

(more)

Replying to questions, she said that, regarding the Arabs in the occupied territories, there was no equivalent to the Defence and Aid Fund regarding South Africa. A major problem was that, while the British public and Press were prepared to believe torture allegations in Greece and South Africa, they were not prepared to consider allegations of such practices by the Israelis.

Miss Birkett, at a later hearing, said in reply to questions that quite definitely there was not a sufficient number of lawyers to represent the aggrieved persons in the occupied territories.

Miss Birkett, who also testified to having been in the occupied territories, said she had no knowledge of any of the deportations being challenged in Israeli courts. She was not aware of any organization for the legal defence of Arabs in the occupied territories. Trials were usually by military courts, and she was not aware of any Arab civil courts still operating in the occupied territories.

Mr. Machover described himself as a mathematician and a university lecturer in London and a former lecturer at Jerusalem University in Israel.

Mr. Heilbronn described himself as a research assistant at the University of London. Both said they intended eventually to return to Israel, but not for the present.

They gave to the Committee about 60 clippings, primarily from the Israeli media, in Hebrew, of stories in which deportations, mass punishment, reprisals, torture and Israeli settlement on Arab lands were alleged.

Mr. Machover also handed over a letter from Israel Shank, described as Chairman of the League for Human Rights of Israel, sent him on 27 March 1970. Mr. Shank was stated to have written that the Israelis were now taking hostages in the West Bank if the person they wished to arrest was not at home. The hostages were said to be old people and children, 13 or 14 years old.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/487
6 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES ARRIVES IN BEIRUT FROM LONDON

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories arrived in Beirut on 5 April, after concluding its hearings in London at both public and private sessions on 3 and 4 April.

The Committee also held several press briefings in London and on arrival in Beirut. In answer to questions, the Chairman and spokesman for the Committee stated:

"While fully understanding that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) is not equipped for investigations, the Committee intends to pursue all evidence to be heard and, to this end, will request the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General of UNRWA to release to it Mr. Reddaway's report on the exhumation of 23 bodies at Rafah and other reports submitted by UNRWA officials of allegations on practices affecting human rights in the occupied territories.

"The Committee will make a further approach to Israel to allow a visit to the occupied territories and hopes that Israel will co-operate in this vital matter. The Committee naturally wants to hear all pertinent evidence and would welcome hearing Israeli officials and others with the evidence needed to fulfill the Committee's mandate. To this end, the Committee has instructed the placement of advertisements, calling on witnesses to come forward, in the newspapers in the United Kingdom, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Israel."

(more)

In answer to other questions, the Committee declined to characterize in any way Israel's refusal so far to co-operate with it or to characterize the evidence heard so far. The Committee, it was stated, takes the view that all evidence must be in before commenting on any part of it.

Witnesses in London

The remaining witnesses heard in London on 3 and 4 April were all of British nationality, as were all witnesses heard in London earlier, with the exception of two Israeli citizens (see Press Release HR/484 of 3 April).

Those heard in open session in London included the following: Christopher Mayhew, Member of Parliament; Mrs. Leila Mantoura, a lady of Palestinian origin and now a British subject; and Richard Slotover, a 22-year old British law student.

Mr. Mayhew said that his personal knowledge regarding the occupied territories was limited to a five-day visit in January 1970 to Jerusalem, Gaza and Ramallah. Tension and fear, he said, were unmistakable. The nature of fear was different in Gaza than in East Jerusalem.

In Gaza, there was a physical fear of reprisal because of the four to five incidents a week between desperate young Arabs, not necessarily guerrillas, and the occupying forces. In East Jerusalem, there was psychological tension because intellectuals were afraid of deportation or detention without trial.

While he had no first-hand knowledge of force being used during interrogations, he had been told by Sir Osmond Williams of Amnesty International that there was documentary proof of physical mistreatment. He himself was a member of Amnesty International and had been urging the Secretary-General of Amnesty International to release the Williams report because Israel had spent nine months investigating the complaints, which was too long.

(Amnesty International has sent the Committee copies of its recently released report, and the Committee will attempt to hear Amnesty members.)

Mr. Mayhew said that he had been to Latrun and it was an extraordinary sight. In what had virtually been a town rather than a village, buildings had not just been knocked down, but every stone had been taken away.

A new development in the increasing of tension, he said, was the murder of some Arabs in the occupied territories by other Arabs for not being militant enough.

(more)

A great problem, he stated, was the enormous ignorance of the Israelis about what was happening in the occupied territories and their lack of understanding of the Arabs. The Israelis got their views about the Arabs from unrepresentative persons, just as the colonial administrations had made the same mistake in Africa.

He paid tribute to the amount of freedom of comment in Israel, considering it was an occupying Power. He himself had been able to hold a press conference in Tel Aviv and say things obviously unpalatable to the Israelis. However, the Israelis could not accept themselves as the detested military occupiers they were, but saw themselves as loving partners of the Arabs. This, he said, created an enormous problem of communication.

Mrs. Mantour said that she had been in Gaza and the West Bank in 1968. She had been wearing a big cross, on which the Israelis spat. When she spat back, she had been arrested and forced to stand in detention for six hours.

She said that the average Arab was terribly mishandled. Textbooks by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for schools were kept out of the occupied territories and allowed by the Israelis to pile up near Allenby Bridge. Before the occupation, she said, there was one textbook for one pupil. Now, it was one for every seven or eight pupils.

Mr. Slotover said that he had been in the area in 1967, 1968 and 1969. He had seen no signs of discomfort or unhappiness among the people, and he felt that the occupation was not oppressive.

A certain degree of discipline was necessary, but, in his view, this was not excessive. He had seen people leaving the occupied territory, but it seemed to him that they were going of their own accord, and he did not see any force used.

* *** *

NO

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/489
7 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS MEETINGS IN MIDDLE EAST

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories began its meetings in the Middle East on 6 April, by hearing in Beirut the testimony of George Dib, an Assistant Professor at Beirut University and Advisor to the Institute for Palestine Studies.

Mr. Dib, who said he himself had not been to the occupied territories, presented the Committee with a number of documents relating mainly to a three-year survey by the Institute of Israeli treatment of Arabs in the occupied territories. He promised to send, at the Committee's request, copies of medical reports said to show evidence of the torture of Arab inhabitants.

The Committee continues its hearings in Beirut on 7 April. It is scheduled to go from Beirut to Damascus on 9 April.

Testimony by Mr. Dib

Mr. Dib said that his Institute had systematically studied the situation through two survey teams, one of which he had been a member of. They had collected reports, including information from Israeli sources, such as Knesset debates and the Israeli Press, and taken down personal testimonials and third-person accounts. This evidence had been heard in Jordan.

Mr. Dib presented the Committee a "memorandum on the treatment of Arabs civilians in the occupied territories", updated from a document presented to the group of experts established by the Human Rights Commisssion.

(more)

Mr. Dib said that Israel had refused to apply the Fourth Geneva Convention on Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Evidence had been found of both collective and individual murder and torture, including burning by cigarettes, pulling out of toe-nails, flogging, electric shock treatment to genitals and the rectum, insertion of a lighted candle in the nose and the application of nitric acid to the lips, he said.

Replying to questions, Mr. Dib said he knew of only four lawyers in Israel giving legal help to the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories and, even if they worked 24 hours a day, they could not give counsel to all who were detained. Their work was obstructed by the deliberate movement of a prisoner from prison to prison, so that counsel could not keep track of a client.

Mr. Dib said that there was a growing concern in Israel about violations of Arab human rights, but, generally, this concern was shown only by leftists and the Communists in the Knesset and the Press. The majority of Israelis did not know what was happening. Most of the evidence was published in Arabic.

Also, he said, euphemisms were used, and Dayan was no longer speaking of reprisals but of peripheral or neighbourhood development. Mr. Dib said that, in fact, the annexation of certain areas had taken place.

Regarding a recent assertion by Israel that those alleging mistreatment could go before Israeli courts, under safe conduct guarantees, he said that he expected at least one person to challenge this through an acceptance in the London Times letters' column this week. Naturally, Israel would have to guarantee that the witness was able to return to Israel in company with an Amnesty International representative, he said.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/490
8 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN LEBANON ON 7 APRIL

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories continued its hearings in Beirut on 7 April, in both public and private sessions, and heard testimony from the following:

Ibrahim Al Abid, Assistant to the Director of the Palestine Research Centre; Halim Barakat and Peter Dodd, professors in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the American University of Beirut; Ahmed Khalifa, described as a former prisoner who left the occupied territories this year; and Kimate Oueida, described as a Palestine refugee.

Mr. Abid presented a memorandum alleging cases of torture, collective punishment, deportation, and attacks on hospitals and medical personnel.

He also said that he had international Red Cross reports, made between 1967 and 1969, which stated that Arab detainees were tortured during interrogation by Israeli military police.

Mr. Abid, who promised to make the Red Cross reports available to the Committee, said that one of February 1968 on Nablus Prison reported torture through cigarette burning, beating of the genitals and electric shocks.

Mr. Barakat and Mr. Dodd presented surveys they had done on the attitudes of the Palestinian refugees. They said that 200,000 Palestinian Arabs, residents of the West Bank, had travelled to the East Bank in 1967 and had become refugees. Their survey, based on random sampling techniques, covered families interviewed in the East Bank in 1967 and 1968.

(more)

Mr. Barakat, who said he was Lebanese, and Mr. Dodd, who said he was American, said the survey showed that many families, early in the war, left their homes temporarily to find safer locations; but later, when attempting to return to their homes, found their way blocked by the occupying forces. They said that the refugees were refused permission to return and ordered to find shelter in the East Bank.

The two professors said there was no indication that the refugees interviewed were either marginal or migratory prior to the war. About 90 per cent of those interviewed had lived for long periods in their home communities. About 91 per cent of the interviewees expressed the desire to return to their homes, with most wanting to return immediately rather than to defer a return until there was an Israeli withdrawal.

Mr. Barakat and Mr. Dodd, in reply to questions, said there was absolutely no indication of the answers having been rehearsed by the interviewees. In 1967, there had been a sense of insecurity and betrayal felt toward their own Governments. By 1968, the refugees felt more secure and generally felt that resistance to the occupation was necessary.

Mr. Khalifa said he had been a student at Cairo University until 1967, when he had returned to Jerusalem to work for his father's shops in East Jerusalem and in order to take an active role in resisting the occupation of Arab Jerusalem. He had returned to Jerusalem about 15 days after the war and had been arrested on 3 January 1968. He had left prison about two months ago. He had been a political officer in the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and had been arrested as a member of what the Israelis term an illegal organization.

Mr. Khalifa, who described his treatment as one of general mistreatment rather than systematic torture, said he had been beaten more than once and had had dogs set upon him while in detention. He gave evidence of seeing the torture of other prisoners.

He said he knew of one person who had died under torture and he, himself, had witnessed a fellow prisoner, Abdul Muttalib Abut Rumaila, going totally mad through his treatment in Israeli camps.

Mr. Khalifa said he, himself, had been handcuffed and hung from a projection from a window-frame until pain prevented him from speaking to the questioning. While blindfolded and handcuffed, he said, dogs had been set on

him to tear his clothes and scratch at his legs. He said he had seen great bruises on a number of fellow prisoners after interrogations.

The witness mentioned the names of a number of prisoners who, he said, had been tortured and were still in prison. He asked that their cases be investigated.

Among the names mentioned were Abdul Latif Ghaith, Jakoub Auda, Ishaq Maraghi, and Mahfuz Jaber, all of whom he said were still in Damuq Prison. Also the cases of Abdul Muttalib Abu Rumaila, Dr. Subahighshie, and Sheker Kawasmi, all of whom, he said, were in Ramleh Central Prison.

Mr. Khalifa was questioned briefly, and the questioning will continue on 8 April.

The last witness was Mrs. Oueida, who testified to leaving Jericho on 9 June 1967 with other refugees and, after crossing Allenby Bridge, of being attacked by Israeli fighter planes. She said the refugees had been machine-gunned and then bombed by a fire bomb. As a result of the fire bombing, she said, her 18-year old and three-year old daughters had died of burns.

The witness submitted photographs of what she said were her children and husband covered by severe burns. Her husband, Sami, who was with her, showed the Committee scars on his head and legs resulting from the burns.

Under questioning, Mrs. Oueida said that the people attacked were exclusively civilian, with no military personnel among them, and were attacked after the cease-fire was entered into with Jordan.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/492
9 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONCLUDES HEARINGS IN BEIRUT

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories concluded its hearings in Beirut on 8 April, after holding further open and closed sessions. The Committee is scheduled to arrive in Damascus on 9 April.

At its last hearings in Beirut, the Committee concluded its questioning of Ahmad Khalifa, described as a former prisoner who left the occupied territories this year, and heard the evidence of Talat El Tamimi, described as a Palestinian refugee, and Yousef Sayegh, described as a Palestinian refugee and now Professor of Economics at American University in Beirut.

Mr. Khalifa said he had received a written order of deportation after serving a two-year sentence. He had been tried before a military court and had refused a lawyer because it was possible only to have an Israeli Counsel, whom he regarded as a part of the occupation. He did not recognize the court's competence.

In prison, attempts had been made to make him make camouflage nets for military purposes, in violation of the Geneva Conventions, but he had refused. Those refusing were punished by solitary confinement for long periods.

Red Cross visits, he said, were infrequent, and the original Red Cross visitor had refused to give his name and had never spelled out the rights of the prisoners. The original Red Cross visitor had been unable to define the status of the prisoners other than as "detainees".

(more)

Red Cross help had improved in his last year of imprisonment with the arrival of a representative named Pierre Monot. The Red Cross representative could be met alone and he contacted the prisoners' families to inform them of the current picture.

However, Mr. Khalifa said, the Red Cross should do more. It must compel the authorities to define the rights and duties affecting the prisoners and publish its reports on the problems which it itself admitted to be chronic, so that international public opinion knew what was going on.

Mr. Khalifa said that the General Secretary of Amnesty International had also visited the prisoners. No other international organization had visited them. Some American Congressmen had visited the camps, but had not met the prisoners.

He termed the treatment in what is known as the Russian compound of the prison of West Jerusalem as bad, that of Damoun Prison to be good, and that of Ramaleh Prison as very bad at the beginning and now reasonable.

The witness said that there was some medical treatment after torture, but often it was not very effective.

Mr. Tamimi said he was originally from Hebron. He had been living in the occupied territories from the time of the war until 13 months later. He had left because of Israeli terrorism and the fact that his family was without his father, who had gone to Lebanon one day before the June 1967 war, and then was refused re-admission by the Israelis.

He said that he himself had seen the Holy Sepulchre profaned by the Israelis, beating priests and taking dogs into it.

Mr. Tamimi said that, in Hebron, Kassim Al Gaabari and Daoud Al Gaabari had died as a result of Israeli torture. The first mentioned was his uncle and had been killed, he asserted, after being tortured and then taken aloft in a helicopter and dropped.

The witness said that several prisoners in Hebron Prison had seen this event.

Mr. Sayegh gave evidence of what he said was economic hardship resulting from the occupation and Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the inhabitants.

(more)

He said that destruction of houses was destruction of capital, and the resulting dislocation meant a change in job routine. Large-scale arrests further disrupted the economic life, while the occupation and the uncertainty affected investment possibilities unfavourably, and, consequently, had a bad effect on employment and income.

He said that professional people suffered a particular hardship because of the occupation conditions. Small shopkeepers now had to re-stock from Israeli wholesalers at higher prices than before the occupation or import from Jordan paying a new Israeli import tax.

Since the occupation, the equivalent of about $14 million annually in remittances to families from abroad had ended. There was forced evacuation of houses and confiscation of land for Jewish settlers. The Israeli tax system, which was much higher than Jordan's, was now imposed and all Arab banks had been closed.

Mr. Sayegh said he had information from a United Nations specialist, whom he was not at liberty to name, to the effect that prices in the occupied territories had risen out of all proportion as compared to the prices in Jordan. Examples given, he said, included a rise in the price of rice from a base of 67 or 70 to 135 in 1969; sugar, from 40 to 65; tea from 80 to 90; and clothing, rising by 40 per cent.

The witness said that, before the war, the occupants received about $30-40 million from tourists in the West Bank and the Holy Places. The visits were now programmed by Israeli agents, who diverted the tourists to Israeli hotels and Israeli businesses.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/496
10 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN DAMASCUS

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Civilian Population in Occupied Territories, following its arrival in Damascus from Beirut on 9 April, began its work in Damascus and heard four witnesses.

The Committee was first welcomed to Syria by a Government representative, M. Rifai, who said that the Committee members were messengers of justice and right. He expressed the hope that the Committee would have every opportunity to see the evidence of the war of Israeli aggression against the population. All the world should become acquainted with this aggression and violation of human rights, he stated.

The four witnesses heard by the Committee on 9 April were the following: Sadaddin Kamal; Mohamedkheir Fayezid Eid; Mrs. Tayme Mandouh Khasabe; and Mamdouh Yusself Djasem.

Mr. Kamal said that, at the time of the June war, he had been a doorkeeper and messenger at the Ministry of Public Works, Kuneitra, and had remained in the occupied territories for six and a half months.

After being confined in houses not their own without being fed, he said, the inhabitants of Kuneitra had been asked to go on radio to say that they were getting food. This had been refused because it was not true and those refusing had been beaten.

Mr. Kamal said that, one day, he had seen five or six Israeli soldiers violating two women. He had attacked them to save the women. Subsequently,

(more)

he said, he had been tortured by the Israelis, leading to complete blindness. One aspect of the torturing had been the drawing of large amounts of blood out of his arms, making him nearly unconscious for three days. The witness said he had seen others tortured.

Mr. Kamal said he had demanded to see Red Cross representatives, but never had, either in prison or Damascus.

Mr. Eid gave evidence that he was responsible for hiring Mr. Kamal in Kuneitra, and that he had had normal sight at the time of the June hostilities.

Mrs. Khasabe said that she was from Djeraba, where she had been a peasant farmer. She had been chased out of the occupied territories by the Israelis about 20 June 1967. All livestock had been taken away.

She said she had given birth to a dead baby when, though nine months pregnant, a number of Israeli soldiers had beaten here with rifle butts because she refused to leave her home. She also said that, after being pulled out of their homes by force, with women being dragged out by their hair, women and children had been made to wait around in the open more than once for two days or so without any food or water.

She said that Israeli soldiers had taken all valuables such as watches, rings and jewelry. The women had been made to strip naked to the waist, in order to humiliate them.

Mrs. Khasabe said she had not been given even a loaf of bread or a glass of water after her miscarriage. At one stage, after the inhabitants had been without food or water for days, they had had to drink their own urine.

The final witness, Mr. Djasem, said he was aged 20 and from Mashta, which he had left on 11 June 1967. At first, he said, all the people in the village, which is about 18 kilometres south-west of Kuneitra, had been shot by the Israelis, including his grandfather.

After questioning, he said he did not know what had happened to his 80-year old grandfather whom he thought must now be dead.

Mr. Djasem also said, after questioning, that he thought about seven people had been killed out of 2,000 inhabitants.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/499
13 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES HEARS TESTIMONY IN DAMASCUS, 10-11 APRIL

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in Occupied Territories continued its meetings in Damascus and heard a number of witnesses in three meetings held on 10 and 11 April. All witnesses said they were either Syrians or Palestinians.

The witnesses heard included the following: Hussein Maarouk; Ahmad Dawwas; Muhammed Nassif; Musa Ersan; Ali Diban; Miss Nadwa Nouri, Abdul Mughrabi and Ahman Rajab; Hamdam Khatib; Abdul Rahman Tomeh; Mrs. Najat Zintabi; Sabri Abdul Khader; Asad Shukairi; and Abdulaziz Diban Radhi.

Testimony of Witnesses

The first witness, Mr. Maarouk, said he was from Kalamer and had left there three days after the Israelis had occupied it. He said he was a Palestinian who had been living there since 1948.

He said he had seen the Israelis shoot two women and a baby, killing them. Also, he said that the Israelis had dynamited four houses while four old women remained in them. The women, whose names he gave to the Committee, were all about 80 years old and widows, he stated.

Mr. Maarouk said that the Israelis had destroyed all livestock of the 200 families living in Kalamer.

Mr. Dawwas said he was a Syrian from Massakie, a town of about 550 people. Israeli troops had entered Massakie, he said, about 15 days after the cease-fire. He said he had been Mukhtar (Headman) of the village.

(more)

After collecting all the people in the village and making them stand in the sun with hands raised, and forcing the villagers to walk barefoot over stones, he said they had been marched away without water.

He said that women had had to urinate in cans to give the children something to drink. The Israelis had refused to give either food or water.

He said that the Israelis had demolished all houses in the village, numbering between 120 and 150.

Mr. Dawwas, who said that the villagers had left Massakie the day after the Israeli occupation, gave the Committee the names of three old men and two old women, whose houses had been demolished while, he said, they were still in them.

Mr. Nassif said he had been Mukhtar of Hafar. He said that Israeli troops had entered the village around 20 June. Because his two sons and six others had protested in not being able to attend to the cattle, he said, they had all been machine-gunned. He gave the Committee their names.

He said that he himself had been beaten for protesting against the conditions. After being confined by the Israelis for two days, he said, all the villagers had been expelled. They had not been given anything to eat or drink by the Israelis.

Asked if any individual Israeli soldier had shown any compassion for the villagers, Mr. Nassif said that all Israeli soldiers had been of a single mind and single attitude in their treatment of the villagers.

Mr. Ersan, who said he was a Syrian from Machta, said that, after occupying the area, seven Israeli tanks had come into the village a week later and machine-gunned villagers while they were working. The Israelis had then thrown the survivors out of the village.

He said that he swore by God that they were given no warning before the machine-guns started firing. The villagers had been told by radio to go on working normally and then had been shot at.

He said that his son and his cousin had been taken away and shot, because the Israelis suspected them of being soldiers. This had been done, he said, in the presence of 40 villagers, who were no more than 10 metres away from the shooting. Eventually, the villagers had been told to leave within two and a half hours or they would all be shot. He said the villagers had not been allowed to get any food or water for their journey.

(more)

Mr. Diban, who also said he was from Machta, said he had gone back to the village one month after the hostilities, creeping in at night. He said he had lost five of his nephews. He had not been there when they were killed, but others had told him they had been killed.

Miss Nouri, Mr. Mughrabi and Mr. Rajab, who gave a joint testimony, said that the Israeli troops had fired at about 100 people in one of the rooms of a First Aid centre in Naab. They said that grenades were thrown into the room.

Mr. Mughrabi said he had been in the room and had escaped through a window. Mr. Rajab said he also had been present when the incident occurred.

Miss Nouri said she had not been in the area, but her brother had been a doctor at the centre and had been taken away with three other doctors before the firing on the centre occurred. She said she was convinced that her brother was still alive.

She had asked the Red Cross to intervene and find out where he was, but the Red Cross had said that the Israelis were not lying when they stated they did not know what had happened to her brother. She said that the other witnesses, Mr. Mughrabi and Mr. Rajab, had testified that he had been taken away by the Israelis. She said that the name of the Red Cross official she had contacted was Moraillon.

Mr. Khatib, who said he was from Zaoura, a village of 2,000 people, said he had been in the occupied territories for two months after the cease-fire.

He said an Israeli tank had fired on two of his sons on 6 June on the day they occupied his village, and had killed them.

In reply to a question, he said that the killing of his sons had taken place before the cease-fire was in effect.

During the occupation, he said, the Israelis threatened the people now and again with their machine-guns. They had not allowed the villagers to farm and had herded them into the school house for sleeping at night. The villagers were allowed to go to their houses during the day and went there without escort. He said they were marched to the school house at night under escort.

Mr. Khatib said that food was very scanty. The villagers had been expelled after two months and given two hours to leave. They had not been allowed to take anything with them, except the clothes they were wearing.

(more)

In answer to a question, he said there had been no forced labour during the two months.

Mr. Tomeh, who said he was from Zaoura, said that Israeli troops had entered the houses shooting at random and about 10 or 15 people had been killed, including one woman who died of fright and a young man who jumped into a well.

Mr. Tomeh showed the Committee his back, which was covered by a patch. He said the Israelis had shot him there for refusing to give up his cattle.

Mrs. Zintabi, who said she had been in Kuneitra for about a month after the occupation, said she had been among 42 people driven into a house, where they had had to live 8, 10 or 12 to a room, and could not get food for the children.

She said they had been kept there for about a week without lighting or food or water. All the livestock died and all the houses had been pillaged. The Israelis said that the Arabs had done the looting, but that was not possible because they were all confined to the houses.

At one stage, she said, the Israelis had given her back some bread and milk and then filmed her for some American visitors. She had then realized it was a ruse.

She said that she had been allowed to leave to join her husband through the intervention of the Red Cross. She said she wished to thank the Red Cross official who got her out.

She said the Israelis made it a condition that she sign a declaration stating that her treatment had been good. She had at first refused to sign such a declaration, because it was not true. However, she said, in the end she had to sign in order to leave.

Mr. Khader, who said he was from Kuneitra, stated, during questions, that there had been before the war 35,000 inhabitants of the town. He had left about a year after the occupation and was about the last to leave, except for some 15 local people who were disabled.

He said that the Red Cross had encouraged the people to stay, saying that that was the wish of the Syrian Government. However, he said, since the people were without food or work there was no alternative but to leave.

(more)

He said that, around 11 June 1967, 1,500 people had been gathered into a church in order to be seen by about five or six foreign Press correspondents. He said only one person among the townspeople gathered had been able to speak English, and he had been beaten so that he could say nothing. At no stage in the interview had any Arabic been used.

Mr. Khader said that, after the Press had seen them, the people were placed 20, 30 or 50 to a house and kept in these houses for almost a month.

Then, he said, the people had been allowed to go to their own houses for about an hour a day. Two or three months later, the people were allowed in their own houses from 7 in the morning to 4 in the evening, and then were confined to the other houses under a curfew.

He said life was never normal and every one of the houses was stripped of carpets, sewing machines and any other possessions.

The Red Cross had been informed after about two months of the occupation that the Israelis were not giving the people food, he said. The Syrian Government had then sent some milk through the Red Cross. After this, people were forbidden to speak to the Red Cross, he said, and a man who had asked for milk from the Red Cross was imprisoned.

He said that, on several occasions after being confined to the houses, old people had been found murdered in their beds. He had helped to bury them.

He said that, before leaving Kuneitra, he had had to sign a declaration in Hebrew, the contents of which he did not understand.

Mr. Shukairi, who said he was from Khoushnieh, said that his town had been entered by Israelis on 7 June and he had left about 13 days after the hostilities.

He said that, one evening at his house, 10 or 13 Israeli soldiers had broken in and made him keep his hands raised from 10 in the evening until 7 next morning.

He testified to seeing Israeli troops shoot unarmed Syrian soldiers and shepherds by his house. He said the unarmed soldiers made for his house because it stood out on the main road.

On one occasion, he said, a barefoot Syrian soldier with no headgear came to his house and an Israeli soldier made the Syrian turn around and then shot him.

(more)

Another soldier, he said, had come another day and met a young shepherd. They were shot on the spot, he said.

Another soldier was said to have been shot while hiding in a carpet in his (Mr. Shukairi's) house.

He said that on the thirteenth day the Israeli soldier guarding him had gone away for a while, and he then escaped to Syria.

Mr. Radhi said he was from Sbitta. Israelis had entered his villsage five days after the cease-fire, had taken everything from the people, and told them they had one hour to get to Syrian territory or they would be shot on the spot.

He said the Israelis were going to demolish the village, but he had not himself seen them do it before the villagers left.

The villagers were marched with their hands over their heads toward Syrian territory, he said, and for 15 minutes the Israeli soldiers fired around them and had killed two girls and a man.

He said that the man was his first cousin. He gave the names of those said to be killed to the Committee.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/501
13 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONCLUDES HEARINGS IN DAMASCUS

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories concluded its meetings in Damascus, after hearing a number of witnesses at two sessions on 12 April. All witnesses said they were either Palestinians or Syrians.

The witnesses heard were the following: Youssef Khaled Awad, Ahmed Shihab Salibi and Hasan Muhammed Ashkar; Mubarak Awad Ibrahim; Mahmoud Kasem Fa'ouri; Muhammed Ahmed Ibrahim; Muhammad Djasem Abou-Iail; and Mahmoud Khuneifis.

The Committee also accepted, as part of its official documentation, statements by Shawkat Shatti of the Syrian Red Crescent and Muwaffakiddin Kuzbari of the Human Rights League of Syria.

Following conclusion of its meetings in Damascus, the Committee proceeded to Amman, Jordan.

Testimony of Witnesses

At its morning meeting on 13 April, the Committee heard the three witnesses together -- Mr. Awad, Mr. Salibi and Mr. Ashkar -- three men who said that they had been arrested separately by Israeli patrols after being expelled from their villages. They were held in Kfar-Younah Prison, where they were first told they would be in prison for three months and then for two years and finally indefinitely, under what they understood was "Article III".

They said they were never tried, but had been told of their sentences through the cell doors. Ultimately, they said, they had been released to Syria through a prisoner exchange organized by the Red Cross after two years and five months.

(more)

They said they had never been told why they were arrested.

Mr. Awad said that they lacked food in prison. He said that they were given, in very scanty quantities, broom straw seeds, tiny pieces of boiled fish and 10-day old stale bread boiled in water.

The witnesses said they were not allowed to sleep, unless in a sitting position. Each said they had been regularly beaten and each stated that blood had been taken from them in large quantities.

Mr. Awad said he was kept in a cell about 40 cms by 50 cms in a standing position for seven days.

Mr. Ashkar said he had been in such a cell for 35 days. During that time, he was given a small amount of water once every 24 hours. He had been given one meal a day, consisting of half an egg and a piece of bread.

The witnesses said they had complained to Red Cross officials about their conditions. They had been able to see the Red Cross officials at first, without Israeli soldiers being present and with a fellow-prisoner interpreting. Subsequently, they were not allowed to see the Red Cross officials. They had not told the Red Cross about the drawing of blood, Mr. Ashkar said, because they were afraid.

Mr. Ashkar said he had been tortured in a heavy black leather jacket, which pulled his shoulders back. He threatened to complain to the Red Cross and had been tortured again for this. As a result of his treatment, he could no longer sleep on his back.

At the second meeting, Mr. Ibrahim said he was from the village of Nassriye. On 12 June 1967, he said, Israeli soldiers had divided the villagers, numbering about 450 people from 40 houses, into groups of 20 or so to a house. They had had to take everything worthwhile from the houses and load the goods onto Israeli trucks.

He said a young man had complained about this injustice and an Israeli soldier had drawn his revolver on the spot and shot him in the head and killed him. He gave the Committee the young man's name and the names of some of the people in his group who, he said, had witnessed the shooting.

He said that he himself had protested, and his left collar-bone had been broken when an Israeli soldier hit him with a rifle butt for protesting. He showed the Committee his collar-bone.

(more)

He said that the next day the villagers had been expelled.

Mr. Fa'ouri, who said he was from Kfarharab, said that on 11 June 1967 Israeli soldiers had beaten him severely with heavy sticks. He showed scars on his right shin which, he said, were evidence of the beating.

He had been transferred from his village to Fiq and, on the way, had passed a wounded Syrian soldier whose wound was conspicuous. The wounded soldier, he said, had been transported with him to Fiq, where he had then been shot with five bullets in the head. "May worms eat me if I am not speaking the truth," he stated.

Eventually, he said, he had been taken to Akhleith Camp, west of Haifa, and placed in a prison there. He had been kept there for 40 days on very scanty food, such as broom straw seeds (wild sorghum).

While in prison, he said, he had been beaten several times by the Israeli guards. One Syrian soldier had been taken away for five days and tortured. He had seen the man come back with a scorched skin.

Mr. Fa'ouri said there had been 204 civilians, including himself, and 360 soldiers in the prison camp. He had been released in a prisoner exchange.

Mr. Ibrahim, who said he was from Darbashiyya, said that, after the Israelis came into his village, they had demolished all the houses and had taken away all the valuables which the people possessed. He said that every day a group of 45 people -- men, women and children, including himself -- had been taken to the mountains about 50 metres away and beaten up.

He said that two people had complained about the treatment and they had been taken away and shot. He gave the names to the Committee. He said the shooting had been witnessed by the village headman and another man. He also gave the Committee the names of these two persons.

Mr. Abou-Lail, who said he was from Bteha, said that the Israelis had taken away all the young men from his village about five days after the fighting. There had then remained about 200 or 300 old men and 500 women and children.

He said they have been expelled from the village without their belongings or food. Children had been dying fromllack of food, and the Israelis said it was better that the children died of starvation then, because they would have been the soldiers of tomorrow.

(more)

Mr. Khuneifis said he was from the village of Sanaber. He said the Israelis had come into the village two hours after the occupation and given the villagers one hour to leave or be killed. The villagers had left, but one weak-minded man who did not understand the situation had tried to return. The villagers had seen him shot. He gave the name of the man to the Committee.

Statements as Documentation

The Chairman said that the hearing of all evidence had now concluded in Damascus. He said that Shawkat Shatti of the Syrian Red Crescent and Muwaffakiddin Kuzbari of the Human Rights League in Syria wanted to make statements.

The Chairman said that the Committee was prepared to have the statements as part of its official documentation; but did not find it necessary to hear the statements, which were not strictly evidence of practices in the occupied territories. He asked the witnesses to give the gist of their statements briefly.

Mr. Shatti said that the first document he had was signed by three doctors whose names he gave on 6 December 1969 and related to the use of drugs given to draw confessions from two people in violation of normal practices. He asked that the names of the two people involved and mentioned in the document be kept secret, in accordance with medical practices and in order to prevent any action being taken against them.

The Chairman said that this would be done; but, since neither the doctors nor the patients involved were witnesses before the Committee, the Committee would later decide on what to do with the evidence in question.

Mr. Shatti said that the second document was one obtained from the Red Cross after much difficulty and contained Red Cross reports of Israeli violations of the Geneva Conventions on prisoners and violation of human rights.

The third document was a letter from the Red Cross which, he said, had also been obtained after much difficulty. He said that the Red Cross worked in great difficulty in Israel, since the Israelis would not facilitate their task.

The fourth document was from the World Council of Churches. Mr. Shatti said that this was signed by United States and British citizens, who must be regarded as impartial.

(more)

In reply to a question, he said that the World Council of Churches had not sent an investigation team into the area, but had sent relief workers who had witnessed many of the facts. He said that the President of the World Council of Churches had himself visited the area and had seen the results of Israeli aggression and could testify to it.

The fifth document, he said, was a statement by the Syrian Red Crescent distinguishing between the racial mentality of the Israelis and the non-racial attitudes of the Arabs.

The sixth document, he continued, was evidence of the violation of the rights of the people in a part of Kuneitra District.

The seventh document was a "red book" of Israeli violations of the Geneva Conventions, with photographs.

The eighth document was a book entitled "Zionism and Peace", which the witness said gave examples of very drastic Israeli actions and which put peace farther and farther away.

The Chairman said that the documents would be studied very carefully and the Committee would then decide on what action should be taken in regard to them.

Mr. Kuzbari began by saying that every refugee had a tragedy to present.

The Chairman interrupted to say that the Committee itself would hear the refugees and did not want any comments on them.

Mr. Kuzbari said he would then summarize his report, and said that the Israelis were practising new Nazi policies.

The Chairman interrupted to say that the Committee was present to collect evidence, not to hear a descritpion of Israeli policies.

Mr. Kuzbari then said that he himself had seen indiscriminate Israeli bombing of military and civilian targets. He said he would hand in his statement as a document.

The Chairman said that it would be part of the documentation of the Committee.

In a closing statement, the Chairman thanked the Syrian Government for its co-operation and the witnesses for appearing before it. He expressed the hope that everything done by the Committee would help in establishing an enduring peace in the area.

The representative of the Syrian Government thanked the Committee for its active, sincere and impartial work.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/503
16 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN AMMAN

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories began its hearings in Amman on 15 April, and all witnesses at the two meetings held said that they were either Palestinians or Jordanians.

The witnesses included the following: Anton A. Atalla, who said he was a Member of the Upper House of the Parliament of Jordan, General Manager in Jordan of the Arab Land Bank and a former Foreign Minister of Jordan; Abdul Hamid Sayegh, described as the Head of the Islamic Courts of Jerusalem and Amman; Nadim Zarou, who said he was the Mayor of Ramallah before and after the occupation; N.J. Simaan, Roman Catholic Bishop and Vicar-General of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem; Archbishop Diodoros of the Greek Orthodox Church; and Constantine Karamash, a parish priest of the Greek Orthodox Church in Amman.

Mr. ATALLA said his home city was Jerusalem and that he had resided there until December 1967, when he was banished by the Israeli Defence Minister, Moshe Dayan.

After the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem, he said, he had seen the looting of the Ambassador Hotel by Israeli military personnel, the bombing of the Victoria Augusta Hospital; looting in Jericho; and wanton and deliberate destruction of houses in the Old City of Jerusalem.

He said that, several weeks after the cessation of hostilities, he had visited the sites of the villages of Mmwas, Beit Numba and Yalu. The villages, which previously had had a combined population of more than 10,000 people, were no longer there. The houses had been dynamited and then bull-dozed over. In his view, the idea was to show visitors that these villages had never existed.

(more)

Mr. Atalla said that, in 1948, the villages had been a tough nut for the Israelis to crack. However, there had been no resistance in 1967. He believed the villages had been wiped out as a punishment for their 1948 resistance.

The witness then gave details of the present legal situation, stating that the Palestine Emergency (Defence) Regulations had been totally repealed in 1948, when the Jordan Army, at the invitation of the Palestinian Arabs, occupied the West Bank. Thus, he stated, the Regulations had no force and could not be used to confer legal power to destroy towns, to confiscate land or to make deportations.

Mr. Atalla said that the inhabitants of the occupied territories were now deprived of access to Jordanian Courts of Appeal and the Jordanian Supreme Court.

ABDUL HAMID SAYEGH, described as the Head of the Islamic Courts of Jerusalem and Amman, said he had been deported from the occupied territories in September 1967. He said that the Israeli Minister of Religion had demanded that the Islamic Courts be revised on the basis of Israeli laws. When told this could not be done, because it was contrary to Koranic concepts and religion, he had demanded the resignation of the officials of the Islamic Courts.

He said that Moslem Courts still operated in the occupied territories, but the Israeli authorities had the right to freeze all decisions and to prevent their implementation.

He then submitted evidence to the effect that the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque had been with the participation of occupation authorities, who had delayed calling fire-engines and had cut off the water supply from the water main near the Mosque.

In his evidence, the witness said that, if the inhabitants of Ramallah, Bethlehem and other Arab cities had not rushed civilian water engines to the spot, and had not the inhabitants of the area carried water from local wells, the fire would have devoured the Moslem shrines.

NADIM ZAROU, who said he was the Mayor of Ramallah before and after the occupation, and had left his town, under a deportation order, on 6 October 1969, said that he remembered his first meeting with the Military Governor, Colonel David Brinn, who, he said, had told the Municipal Councils of Ramallah and Bireh: "Our occupation of your land differs from that of Britain. We are here to stay. I will not have mercy on any one who opposes our plans. We will imprison people, destroy houses, and torture civilians."

(more)

In Beirut, he said, he had seen a Captain Ilan ordering 30 people from the village to lie down on the ground and then ordering his men to climb a wall to jump on their bodies. He said that this had gone on for half an hour. The men had then been imprisoned in Ramallah Prison for 36 days. He said that the Red Cross had a report on their conditions when released.

He also related a case of Mohammad Mustafa Ghannam, who he said worked for the Alamary UNRWA Camp and, in 1968, had been arrested by Captain Ilan for refusing to collaborate in giving information. After a protest was made to a Mr. Castles, Director of UNRWA in the West Bank, the man had been released after 15 days. He said that he and Mr. Castles had seen that the man could not stand because of torture, beating, and fierce bites from wild dogs.

The witness said that Mr. Castles had presented a report to the UNRWA head office in Beirut, and that the incident was also known by Red Cross representatives.

Mr. ZAROU said that the Red Cross in Amman also knew of a case, at the beginning of 1968, when two young Arabs were taken away from Ramallah and shot by two Israeli soldiers. One of the Israeli soldiers had been released from this killing because the Military Governor said he had merely obeyed the orders of the other soldier. The second soldier, he said, had been brought to trial, but was alleged to be insane. He said that, by the time he had left Ramallah, there had been no judgement regarding the incident, which had occurred on a road outside Ramallah.

The Mayor of Ramallah continued his testimony in the afternoon, when he gave some details on the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque in 1969, which he said had caught fire in two places, in opposite corners, 35 metres from each other. He said that this showed that more than one hand was involved in the fire.

He presented evidence, in which he stated that he had been at the fire, at which there had been six Israeli fire engines, but that only one was functioning. He said that the water supply for the district had been cut off and the Israeli firemen refused to supply water from their tanks. He said the population had had to take water in tins to put out the fire, and had to work for several hours to do this. In his view, the Israeli fire engines could have done the job in less than 15 minutes.

(more)

Mr. ZAROU said that the population of Ramallah District had been between 180,000 and 200,000 before the occupation. He estimated that about 24,000 people had left in all, mostly in the early days of the occupation.

He was asked to provide the Committee with an up-to-date list of the people he had mentioned as being subject to mistreatment. He said that he would bring them from the files he had with his organization, the Palestine Liberation Organization. He said that, in most cases, he had witnessed the results of this mistreatment, since the people had come to him complaining and he had had to take up their cases with the occupying authority.

The Mayor of Ramallah said that, throughout his period in the occupied territories, he had mentioned the grievances to various Consulates accredited to Jerusalem, particularly the French, American and British representatives. He had also met with UNRWA and Red Cross officials often. He had had every indication that the Red Cross wanted to give every assistance, but its officials had been refused permission to contact prisoners in some cases.

He said that, early in 1969, he had done a tour with Peter Sutherland, United States Consul in Jerusalem, to the Ramallah villages of Deir Suden, Ajjoul Karawala, Aboud and Deir Abu Mishaal. On the tour, they had seen several persons suffering from a paralysis of the arms or legs, ulcers in the neck, pulled out finger-nails and loss of hearing. He said that Mr. Sutherland had compiled a report giving the names of the people involved and the details of their mistreatment. However, the people had asked that their names not be revealed, because they knew they would be put back in jail.

The witness said that the Civil Courts in Ramallah were a mockery of justice and the Military Courts were even worse. He said that the verdicts were very often prepared in advance by the Military Governor.

Asked if he had been allowed to visit Ramallah Prison, Mr. Zarou said he had repeatedly asked to go there, but had only been allowed in twice; on both occasions, as a prisoner. He had been imprisoned for about 10 days in September 1968 and for about a week in 1969, before being deported. He said that he had not been given a copy of the deportation order.

In prison, he himself had not been subjected to mistreatment, but he had seen the results of torture on others and had heard the screams of those being tortured.

(more)

In reply to a question, he said that certain sentences were given in writing. In one case, it had been life, plus 10 years plus 20 years in consecutive sentences. In the case of one man, William Nassar, the sentence had been 169 years.

N.J. SIMAAN, Roman Catholic Bishop and Vicar-General of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, presented written evidence in which he said there had been deportation of people, violation of human rights, discrimination and profanation of the Holy Places.

He said that, since 1967, he had only been in the occupied territories for 24 hours to attend a funeral.

Archbishop DIODOROS of the Greek Orthodox Church said that, in June 1967, he had seen Israelis entering churches, where they committed immoral acts. He said they had also stolen icons from the churches.

He said that, on attempting to cross the Allenby Bridge, an Israeli officer had pulled him by the icon around his neck and treated him very badly. The Israeli soldiers had forced him to cross the river in a deep part, and he would have been drowned if the Arabs had not saved him.

CONSTANTINE KARAMASH, who said he was a parish priest of the Greek Orthodox Church in Amman, said he had been in the occupied territories for 10 days in December 1969 and for seven days in March 1970. He had been sent there by his Archbishop to get the facts.

Before the occupation, he said, the Greek Orthodox community in Jerusalem had been about 35,000 people; it was now down to 10,000. While in the occupied territories, he said, the Jews had called him a "big pig" and spat upon him.

He associated himself with the written evidence alleging the profanation of churches.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA — NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/504
17 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN AMMAN

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories continued its hearings in Amman in two meetings on Thursday, 16 April. All witnesses heard said they were either Palestinians or Jordanians.

The witnesses heard included the following: Nagib El Ahmed, a former Deputy of the Jordanian Parliament from Jenin; Salah Anantawi, who said he was from Nablus and was now Secretary of the Deportees Section of the Jerusalem Liberation Committee; Ragheb Aburas, who said he was from Bireh of Ramallah District; Abu Ras; Ahmad Abu Quor of Jordanian Red Crescent; and Rouhi El Khatib, who said he was the Mayor of Jerusalem but now banished and living in Amman.

The Committee heard briefly the testimony of Mustafa Ahmed Al Hadmi, and the the hearing of this witness will continue at the Committee's next meeting.

Testimony of Witnesses

The first witness, Mr. El Ahmed said he had been deported from the occupied territories on 1 September 1969. Prior to that, he had been held as a prisoner in Israel from 19 August 1968.

He said that he had been previously imprisoned by the Israelis for refusing to agree to the then stated policy of the Israelis to make the West Bank a Palestinian State. About three months after the occupation, he and most of the notables of the town had sent a cable to the Secretary-General, U Thant, protesting the conditions and the Israeli policy.

(more)

He said that, after his arrest in August 1968, he had been sentenced to imprisonment and ultimately spent one year and 14 days in prison. He had been accused of giving military information to the Ambassador of Iraq in Amman and of contacting Mr. Arafat of Al Fateh.

He said that he had denied the charges and had been beaten and tortured. This included the pulling out of his hair, eyebrows and whiskers. He had been thrown to the floor and hit with a table. The interrogators had jumped on his body, burned him with cigarettes, beaten him with an electric fan and hit him with sticks and chairs.

Mr. El Ahmed said that, during that treatment which lasted for 27 days, police dogs had also been set on him. Every evening, there had been two or three beatings and also one every day.

He said that those who had tortured him during the interrogation at Jenin Prison had been Majors Yacubi, Baruch and Menahem and Lieutenant Haim.

He said that he had not been brought to court until after two months of interrogation. No visits had been allowed during that period, and his relatives had not been told where he was.

At this stage, the witness related that, in the interrogation centre, he had first met a Red Cross official named Michel Conveir. He had met this Red Cross representative several times, and this representative had also gone to his trial.

He said that he had been told the charges against him in Hebrew, but the Prosecutor had refused to translate the charges into Arabic. It had been translated orally into Arabic by a policeman in his cell.

The witness said that he had, at first, appointed an Israeli Arab lawyer, but he had been made to withdraw because the Israelis had told the lawyer that he could not defend a man who acted against the Israeli State. He said that this particular lawyer had shortly thereafter been appointed a judge.

He said that, ultimately, an Israeli Arab Christian lawyer who was a communist, Hanna Nakkraa, had defended him to the end.

His trial had ended on 26 January 1969. The three military judges had sentenced him to four years imprisonment, of which two years was a suspended sentence. He had been released on 1 September 1969, on the condition that he and his family would leave the occupied territory for the East Bank and never return.

(more)

He said that he had served his sentence in Nablus Prison. He had been placed in a solitary cell, and then after contracting bronchitis had been transferred to the Medical Centre of the Prison, only after two hunger strikes protesting his condition.

The witness said that Red Cross parcels were stolen by the Israelis and never reached the prisoners.

He had seen people tortured in both Nablus and Jenin Prisons. He had seen the results particularly at Nablus, because he had been in the infirmary and had been there when those who had been tortured were admitted. He had, on several occasions, told Mr. Conveir about what he had seen.

The witness then gave the name to the Committee of a man who, he said, had died as a result of a beating administered by a policeman called Haim at Jenin Prison. Mr. Conveir had also been informed about this. In December 1968, he said, he had shared a cell with a 75-year old man, who showed the marks of beatings; one of his fingers was broken. The man had told him that he had been tortured with electric shocks.

The witness then gave the Committee the names of several people who were said to have been tortured. The torture was said to include beating with rubber whips encasing metal wires; beating until a leg was broken; beating until a hand was broken; the setting of dogs on prisoners; suspension to the roofs of cells by their hands; beating with iron rods until a shoulder blade was smashed to a pulp; enemas of red hot peppers; and the forced committing of homosexual acts.

Mr. Anantawi, who said he was now Secretary of the Deportees Section of the Jerusalem Liberation Committee, said that he had been deported from Nablus in 1968.

He gave the Committee the names of 17 people who had officially been announced by the occupation authorities as having been deported between 23 September 1967 and 4 November 1969. He also gave the names of 51 people said to have been forced to agree to leave the occupied territories between 12 December 1968 and 5 February 1970.

Mr. Anantawi handed in evidence stating that deportations were part of a policy to have the occupied territories vacated by expelling the leadership, including public officials, physicians, teachers, trade unionists and students.

(more)

He said that many memoranda protesting the policy had been sent by the citizens of the West Bank to U Thant and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

The witness said that the Israelis had told the ICRC that personal applications to return to the West Bank would be entertained if those applying stated that they would abstain from political activity or actions threatening Israel's security. He said that two women, Mrs. Nawal Tite and Mrs. Huda Abdulhadi, had applied through the ICRC to return to Nablus about eight months ago, but had heard nothing.

Mr. Aburas, who said he was from Bireh of Ramallah District, said that he had been arrested twice, in October 1967 and in July 1968.

When arrested the first time, he said, intelligence officers had searched his house, but had found nothing. He had then been taken to the office of the military Governor of Ramallah, where he had been stripped naked and then beaten until he fainted. When he came to, he said, he had denied any connexion with the fedayeen. He had then been beaten with whips.

He said that the torture had gone on for five days, and then he had been transferred to Mascubieh Prison, where he had been tortured for another four days.

He said that this torture had consisted of beating on the face, suspension by his arms from the ceiling and being faced by wild dogs. He said that this torture had gone on for 23 days, and included the connecting of electric current to his ears.

He said that he was released on 12 April 1968 for lack of evidence.

He had been re-arrested on 12 July 1968. This time, he had first been beaten for 20 days continuously, and then transferred to Sarafand Prison. There, his finger nails had been pulled out, a hose inserted in his rectum and water pushed in; and there had also been the insertion of the tube of a ball-point pen into his penis, causing bleeding.

The witness said that, at Sarafand, he had also suffered from cold water falling on his head, drop by drop, for a period of 10 to 15 minutes, with every drop feeling like a hammer blow.

Since there had been no evidence against him, he had been released and deported to the East Bank on 13 February 1969.

(more)

Mr. Ras said that, for about five months, he had shared a prison cell with an Arab soldier whose jaw had been shattered by machine-gun fire. All treatment was refused this prisoner, whose name he gave to the Committee; and there were worms in his wound, he stated.

He also said that another prisoner had had his left arm paralyzed after there had been placed under his arm pits on several occasions hot-boiled eggs and his arms forced on to these eggs. He said the prisoner had an Iraq accent and had been tortured at the time of the hanging of Jewish spies in Iraq.

The witness said that the following had been those who had tortured him: Colonel Abu Zelike and Majors Yacoub Sapir, Rami, Zaki, Toloski and Baruch.

Ahmad Abu Quora of the Jordanian Red Crescent gave the Committee what were described as photostat copies of letters from the ICRC -- some of late 1969 and most dated 1970 -- stated to give evidence of the demolition of houses, collective punishment, prevention of family reunion, maltreatment of detainees, expulsions and refusal to forward parcels from relatives to prisoners.

Mr. El Khatib, who said he was the Mayor of Jerusalem but now banished and living in Amman, submitted memoranda regarding Jerusalem.

He said that, between "June 1967 and 15 November 1969, a total of 7,554 Arab houses and properties had been demolished in Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Mr. El Khatib said that this figure did not include houses and properties demolished or blown up after 15 November 1969 which was roughly calculated to be at the rate of about 45 monthly.

He said that the number of Arabs affected by these operations was estimated at about 50,000 people, who had been dispersed in and outside the occupied areas.

He gave the names of 13 people who, he said, had died under the debris, not having heard the loud-speakers announcing the impending demolition. Of these alleged victims, one was said to be from Jerusalem, four from Beit Noba, one from Imwas and the rest from Yalu.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/506
20 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES ISSUES PRESS STATEMENT IN AMMAN

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories issued the following statement to the Press on 19 April in Amman:

"The Special Committee's attention has been drawn to the Press Release of Friday, 17 April 1970, issued by the Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations, in which the Permanent Mission states that the Special Committee 'continues to give automatic publicity to Arab allegations submitted to it without even going through the motion of examining such allegations and weighing their veracity', and that this method of proceeding 'confirms that the Special Committee serves as a mere channel for the dissemination of Arab propaganda and that its conclusions will reflect the Committee's complete subservience to Arab belligerency towards Israel'.

"The Special Committee refuses to be distracted from the performance of its functions by the invective persistently directed against it by the Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations. In the Committee's opinion, the procedure adopted by it is no more than recongnition of the principle that full publicity is an indispensable feature of a fair hearing. The Special Committee would have thought that publication of the testimony would give an opportunity to Israel to present evidence in rebuttal.

"The Special Committee repeats that, in establishing the Committee, the General Assembly's concern was with the violation of human rights in the territory occupied by Israel as a result of military action and still remaining

(more)

under Israeli military occupation. The General Assembly's mandate to the Special Committee does not deal with the question of the Jews in Arab lands.

"The Permanent Mission of Israel is not justified in presuming that the evidence laid before the Committee will not be subject to a critical evaluation.

"Since the ostensible reason for the issuance of the Press Release by the Permanent Mission of Israel is to comment on Press queries regarding verificiation of the allegations, the Committee would like also to comment on this aspect of its work.

"The Committee has attempted to contact all Red Cross, UNRWA, governmental officials, physicians, lawyers and others mentioned by the witnesses. It is attempting to cross-check every allegation in every possible way.

"Finally, the Committee cannot repeat enough the fact that it has placed paid notices in the Israeli papers asking witnesses to appear before it. It repeats that request in the face of the Government of Israel's refusal to co-operate with the Committee."

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/507
20 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONCLUDES HEARINGS IN AMMAN

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories has concluded its hearings in Amman, with one hearing on Saturday, 18 April, and another on Sunday, 19 April. All witnesses at the meetings said they were either Palestinians or Jordanians.

The witnesses heard included the following: Munir Abdallah Ghanam of the Palestinian Liberation Front; Othaman Abdulhadi El Aaraj, who said he was from Walhjej; Najeh Mohammad Issa El Khatab of Karameh; Abdel Rahim Saleh El Majthuba, who said he was the Mukhtar of Yalo village; Mohammed F. Maraqa, who said he was from Jericho, and his six-year old daughter, Soher; Seifiddin Ismail Abdel Fattah Tayem, who said he was from Nuba; and Suleiman Mohammed Sheikh Eid.

Testimony of Witnesses

The first witness heard, Mr. GHANAM, said he was a fighter with the Palestinian Liberation Front. He had been at Nablus at the time of the 1967 hostilities and had gone to Damascus three months later.

He said he had been arrested by the Israeli Army with two companions after being severely wounded through explosions in an Israeli mine field on 20 October 1969. At that time, the three of them had been wearing military clothes and carrying arms. When the Israeli Army caught them, they had been bleeding from wounds for about 12 hours. The Israelis had refused them water, unless they revealed information, and had refused to enter the mine field to bring them out.

(more)

He said they had to crawl out in great pain. They had been transferred to the Jericho Military Hospital and only after one month, he said, had a member of the Red Cross visited the three of them. His leg had been amputated.

He had later been transferred to a prison and no Red Cross representative had been allowed to visit the prisoners. While in Ramleh Hospital, he said, one prisoner who had lost an eye in the battle at Hebron in 1969 had told him that the Israelis had then taken out his normal eye.

He said that he had shared a cell in the Ramleh Central Prison with a man who had undergone such barbaric treatment that he had had to be taken to a mental hospital.

On another prisoner, Mr. Ghanam said, he had seen cigarette burns and had been told that anti-aircraft cartidges had been pushed into his anus.

Mr. EL AARAJ, who said he was from Walhjeh, said he had been arrested on 21 March 1968. After his arrest, he had been stripped naked in Bethlehem Prison and beaten for five hours on his head, stomach and sexual organs. His left thumb had been broken from a blow from an iron bar.

On the day of his arrest, after the beating, he said, he had been charged with resisting the occupation and with infiltrating into the West Bank. He had been able to show an Israeli census card proving his presence since June 1967.

Subsequently, on the sixth day of his arrest, he had received an administrative order for his arrest for 15 days under the Emergency Regulations. His lawyer, Mrs. Felicia Langer, had demanded a trial.

On 17 September 1968, he had been tried and released. He had been arrested again on 26 October 1968. Taken to Almaskobyeh (the Russian Compound), he said he had been beaten especially on the head and sensitive parts. He had been released on 28 October 1968, and had gone to an UNRWA clinic in Shufat, where he had been examined by Dr. Subhi Ghoshe. The doctor, he said, had stated that he was suffering from haemorrhage in the left ear, canal retina of both eyes, and boils all over the body. He said the medical report was with Mrs. Felicia Langer.

He said the was then released and held in the Russian Compound until 19 November 1968. A question had been asked about his case in the Knesset by Emil Tawfik Habibi.

(more)

He said he had subsequently been released. Finally, he had been re-arrested on 14 May 1969 and deported on 9 June 1969. He said no real charge had ever been made against him. He was expelled on the charge of disturbing the peace and endangering State security.

Mr. EL KHATAB said he had been arrested in Karameh on 20 March 1968 and ultimately deported on 9 November 1969.

He said, in reply to a question, that he had not been involved in the fighting for Karakeh, which the Israeli forces occupied on 20 March 1968.

He said that, after his arrest, he and others had been forced to pass between two rows of soldiers, who had beaten them with axe-handles.

At the Jericho Barracks, he said, he had been tortured through electric shocks and beatings with metal rods.

Mr. El Khatab said that on 23 March 1968 he had been taken to Sarafand Prison. He had been tied to a window by his wrists and suspended there. He had been tortured, he said, for three days continuously. He had then had salt stuffed into his mouth and been chased by dogs. During this process, the witness said, salt had been put into his mouth three times and he had been refused any water. He had also been beaten on the genitals.

Throughout the interrogation, he said, he had denied he was a commando and insisted that he was a greengrocer.

He had subsequently been taken to Jenin Prison for 16 months and it had been found he was suffering from tuberculosis. He said that any prisoner who complained to the Red Cross about his treatment was heavily beaten.

Later, he said he had been taken to Ramleh Prison, where, he said, he had also been beaten.

Mr. El Khatab said that there he had known a man who had died of bleeding as a result of torture. He did not know his name. When he had complained to the Red Cross about the conditions, he had been beaten.

He said he had been deported after being told by the prison authorities to sign an appeal for a compassionate discharge.

The witness said that in prison he had been forced to work on the manufacture of plastic articles and military camouflage netting.

(more)

ABDEL RAHIM SALEH EL MAJTHUBA, who said he was the Mukhtar of Yalo village, stated that his village had been occupied on 6 June 1967. The Israeli forces had begun blowing up the houses of the village of 3,500 people that day, and people had been buried under their homes. He gave the names to the Committee.

Mr. El Majthuba said that the village had been completely demolished, with the rubble bulldozed and transported away. He said the villagers had been expelled, but around 14 June, some had returned to see if they could salvage some personal property. He said he had learned that the Israelis had killed five of them. He gave the Committee their names.

The witness said the deaths had been ascertained when their relatives had gone to search for them and had found their bodies under the debris, riddled with bullets. He said he knew people had been buried under the rubble, because their relatives had found their bodies.

(During the questioning on this point, the Chairman informed the witness that both levity and histrionics were out of place at a serious hearing. When the witness asked if the Committee doubted his word, the Chairman said that was not the point. The Committee was attempting to establish the facts. The Committee was asking the questions, not the witness.)

The witness said it was not possible to appeal to anybody in order to get the infirm and the aged out of the houses before the demolition. Every request to go into the village was refused. He said that, of the 12,000 inhabitants of his village, Emmwas and Bait Nuba, all of which were destroyed, about 11,000 had been forced to leave for the East Bank. The 1,000 who had not come over had found places with relatives in other villages.

Mr. MARAQA, who said he was from Jericho, appeared with his daughter Soher, who he said was now six years old. Israeli planes, he said, had bombed civilians with napalm. He said there had been no troops among the group he was with who were fleeing from Jericho. There had been no resistance.

He said that he had lost the sight of one eye in this strafing; his daughter had been set completely on fire; and a 10-year old son had died some hours after the incident.

(more)

Mr. Maraqa said that his daughter had been taken to a hospital in Amman the next day and had, subsequently, spent six months in hospital. The Red Cross had taken her to Switzerland for five months, and later another three or four months had been spent in another hospital in Amman.

The witness gave the Committee three photographs of his daughter's condition after admission to the hospital in Amman after arriving from Jericho. He said his daughter was still being treated for her injuries.

He gave the Committee the names of others said to have died or been injured in the air attack, which he said had taken place on 7 June, in Jericho, and on the Amman road.

Mr. TAYEM, who said he was from Nuba, said that the Israelis had searched his house, night and day, from 5 July 1968, in an effort to find his brother. He himself had been imprisoned on 17 October 1968 and taken to Hebron Prison. He said he had been given no food for four days; then he had been given salty water. Still without food, he said, he had been given another glass of such water on the eighth day.

Mr. Tayem said that he had been sick. He said others had been tortured more than he had. He gave the Committee the names of people said to have had their hands broken, been beaten on the sexual organs, a jaw smashed, a leg broken and hard-boiled eggs placed under the arm pit.

The witness said the main torturer had been Haem. He was in uniform without marks of rank. Other torturers, he said, were Major Abu Rustum, Captains Yuusseff and Harun, Major Ishak Elli and the Military Governor, Ofar Ben David.

Mr. Tayem said he had been expelled on 14 August 1969 after a trial. He had been expelled with his father. They were forced to sign a document, the contents of which were not disclosed. He said his trial had been before a military court on charges of inciting students against the security of the State. He said the charges had not been proved and his arrest had therefore been made by administrative order.

At the King Hussein Bridge, he said, he and his father had found the rest of his family who were also expelled. There were 11 persons in all.

He said that the Red Cross visited the prison every three months. On those days, food improved and those with traces of torture were hidden. Anybody who complained was beaten.

(more)

He said his father had been arrested on 5 November 1969 and kept in Hebron Prison until the family was expelled. The family had had no difficulty in crossing into the East Bank because, although the Jordan authorities tried to prevent such crossings, they had seen his family being beaten on the other side of the bridge. The Jordan authorities had therefore adopted a lenient attitude in this case.

In reply to questions, he said that his father had also been tortured. He had lost the sight of one eye and the hearing of one ear. He had not seen his father while in jail.

Asked why his father had not come to testify, the witness said that he was ill at the moment.

The witness said that, whenever there was action by the fedayeen, the Israelis would arrest 250 to 300 people as hostages and torture them. One such hostage, whose name he gave to the Committee, had, he said, been tortured in front of all the prisoners in Hebron.

The witness said he was 17 years old now. At the time of his arrest, he was 16 and was kept with the adults. He said there were other prisoners younger than he was. They had suffered the same treatment. Some had been 12 years old, he said.

SULEIMAN MOHAMMAD SHEIKH EID said he had been beaten, resulting in the loss of his right eye.

The Chairman recorded that it could be seen that there was no eye in the right socket.

The witness said that his hands had also been crushed under the beating by Israeli forces.

The Chairman recorded that the fingers were crushed and malformed, and stated that the case was one of obvious severe injury.

The witness said he had lost his eye because of a blow by a meat-axe from an Israeli soldier, who accused him of being a terrorist. He said he had denied this. The witness said his beating had taken place in July 1967 in Gaza.

The Chairman said the condition of the witness was prima facie evidence of which the Committee would try to get confirmation in the form of a medical report from the hospital where he had been treated in Gaza.

(more)

The witness said his brother had witnessed the attack on him with the meat-axe when the brother had tried to protect him, he had also been attacked with the meat-axe. He, himself, had been unconscious after the attack and had been informed in hospital by witnesses that his brother had died from his injuries.

The witness said this was the first time he had ever reported on this incident, either to the Arabs of the Jews. The witness gave the names of UNRWA personnel who, he said, could testify to his having a perfect eyesight before the alleged incident.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/508
23 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES
IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN CAIRO

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories began its hearings in Cairo on 22 April. Every witness was either a United Arab Republic citizen or Palestinian.

The witnesses included the following: Dr. Kamal Malak Gobrial, a surgeon; Mohammed Derbas, a civilian hospital aide; Mrs. Hekmat El-Sayed Ahmed Eldib, an Inspector of the Ministry of Education; Dr. Onsi Serga, a doctor at El Arish Hospital; Dr. Shehata Habib, Director of Gaza Hospital; Miss Eisha Awad Hagazi from El Arish; Youssef Darwish, who said he was Secretary of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers; Miss Kamilia Kamel Elzerbawi and Mrs. Menaawer Soliman Elzerbawi, who appeared together; Dr. Mahmoud Soliman Elbark; and Mohamed Nader Lotfi, who had been Director of Social Affairs at El Arish.

Testimony by Witnesses

Dr. Gobrial said he was a surgeon at a Cairo hospital. He had been at El Arish Hospital for a year and a half, until 16 September 1969.

He said that the Israelis had not allowed the necessary facilities and medicines to the Hospital and a number of doctors had left because they could not fulfil their functions. Finally, he was the only doctor in the Hospital from February 1968.

He said he had treated a number of victims of torture, many of whom had their hearing affected. Others had had fractures from beatings and showed burns from cigarettes or hot irons.

He said he was not allowed to keep any medical reports on the cases and his room had been searched many times.

(more)

Dr. Gobrial said that about 20 houses had been destroyed in the area in 1967. One man had died in the rubble, he said. He gave the Committee the name. He said the body had been delivered to the Hospital around October 1967.

Regarding the hearing cases, he said that eardrums had burst because of beatings. Every day he had to treat five or six cases resulting from torture. He had seen bodies with gunshot wounds. However, he had not been able to make any autopsy, because the Israelis would not allow it.

There had been a severe shortage of medicines for diabetes and of vitamins. He said that numerous complaints had been made. Medicines, whose effectiveness had expired, were finally given. He had told the Red Cross about this.

Dr. Gobrial said that four Israeli doctors had taken over the Hospital in August 1968. There had not been any surgeon. Examinations had been done through interpreters, contrary to medical ethics. Also, he said, the Israeli doctors were heavily armed, which intimidated the patients.

Sanitary conditions were inadequate, in his view. The Red Cross officials had been able to do very little to alleviate conditions. The Israelis delayed treatment for even the most urgent cases.

In reply to a question, he said that there was no interference in the professional work of the United Arab Republic doctors when they were treating patients. He had not had contact with UNRWA medical officers.

Dr. Gobrial said he had worked in the Outpatient Department, when the Israeli doctors had taken over. Surgery was halted. There had been a lack of anaesthesia. Surgical cases were transferred to Gaza, he stated.

Mr. Derbas, who said he was a civilian hospital aide, said he had worked in the Dar El Shefah Hospital in Gaza and had escaped from the area in September 1967, going to Jordan.

The witness said he had been imprisoned by the Israelis, on the second day of the hostilities, in Atlite Prison. He had helped Egyptian doctors attend the wounded who had been taken to the prison.

Mr. Derbas said that he had seen worms coming out of the wounds of Arab soldiers imprisoned. He gave the Committee the names of the wounded soldiers, who he said were neglected by the Israelis.

He had been tortured by electric shocks in July 1967, until unconscious, in an attempt to get military information from him. He had not had any information.

(more)

He said that he had been later castrated after this electrical shock torture. All his nails from his hands had been pulled out with pliers, he stated.

Mr. Derbas asked the Committee to bring a doctor to examine him. He would expose his body to show the hideous crimes perpetrated on him.

He had been examined by other doctors and there was a medical report available. He had been examined by doctors from the Working Group of Six. A medical report was available at the Arab League.

The Chairman said he understood that a medical report was available with the Working Group of Six, and that the Committee would examine it, as well as the one with the Arab League.

The witness said he had been accused of carrying arms, of knowing where arms were hidden, and of helping Jordanian soldiers.

He started to make certain comments regarding the creation of Israel, Zionism and the United States, but the Chairman interrupted to state that a commentary was not wanted, only facts.

Mr. Derbas said he had been seen, while in prison and in the hospital, by a delegation of American persons. He had never been seen by the Red Cross.

He had not been able to discuss his condition with the Americans because he had been prevented from speaking. There had been about seven American visitors. They had come between 12 and 19 June 1967. American television had carried his picture, he said. The visit had taken place after his testicles had been removed.

Mrs. Eldib said she had been at El Arish as an Inspector for the Ministry of Education. She said her son, who, at the time on 19 August 1967, had been 12 years old had been shot in the stomach by an Israeli patrol. He had been standing on the balcony of her house.

There had been a curfew, she later discovered, but this had not been announced, she stated.

Mrs. Eldib said that the Israelis had said that he was a war casualty and had refused to help at first. Later, he had been taken to El Arish Hospital and operated on. However, there had been no plasma or oxygen.

She said that, after 11 days, she had been able to get a Red Cross representative to see her son in the hospital. There had been complications in her son's condition, because of lack of adequate treatment. She and her son

had then been removed to Beersheba by helicopter against her will. At Beersheba, plasma and oxygen had been available.

The Red Cross representative had then accompanied her and the son to Cairo, where the medical treatment had been completed.

Mrs. Eldib said that, about 1 August 1967, the Israelis had wanted the schools opened and to use a Hebrew curriculum and Israeli textbooks. She had protested the change. The Israelis had said that the only change in the books would be those parts regarding Israel.

Mrs. Eldib said that the Israelis had not respected the Holy Places and walked in wearing shoes. Israeli soldiers had forced old men and women to dance in the streets, she stated.

She said that, during searches, Israeli soldiers would take any article from the houses that they liked.

On 18 August 1967, she said, there had been a silent protest against the conditions, with the children on strike and the shops closed.'

At the beginning of the occupations she said, there had been a general curfew, with the people being allowed one hour a day for shopping. From July on, she said, the curfews were announced from time to time by microphone. She said that many other people had been shot during the unannounced curfew of 19 August 1967.

She said that complete blocks of houses had been destroyed while she was in the occupied territories.

Dr. Serga said he was a doctor who had been at El Arish Hospital at the time of the hostilities. He had been present when the son of the last witness had been brought to the Hospital.

He testified that there had been no plasma or oxygen. Because of lack of necessary antibiotics, he said, the child's abdomen had burst after about 11 days. He said that, by accident, there had been a Red Cross doctor present that day, and the boy had been removed for treatment.

Towards the end of September, he said, he had complained to the Red Cross about the lack of food and of malnutrition. The Israeli representative had said that there was food. He had pointed out that the people had no money to buy food.

His clinic had been demolished on or about 19 August 1967. This was done intentionally, because he was alleged to be "on the list".

(more)

Dr. Serga said there had been many incidents of people being shot during the curfews. He said that most private medical clinics were destroyed by the Israelis.

The witness said that the curfews prevented medical attention and had resulted in the lack of essential treatment.

There had been much sporadic shooting after the cease fire, with many people wounded. His ambulance had been fired on three times. This had occurred during the curfews.

Dr. Habib said he had been the Director of Gaza Hospital and had remained so for the first two months of the occupation.

On 7 June, he said, the Israeli forces had collected almost all young and middle-aged men and called them prisoners of war. He said that this included the civilian medical staff and patients. Israeli soldiers had come to the Hospital and arrested 120 of the total staff, including women.

Dr. Habib said that they had been imprisoned for six weeks in Atlite Jail.

He said that all hospital transport, including four ambulances, had been taken. After two weeks, one ambulance had been returned.

The witness said that all hospital water-pipes had been damaged during the hostilities. At one stage after the occupation, he said, the Hospital had been without water for five days. After that the Israelis had brought some water for the Hospital.

There had been 220 patients in the Hospital, he said. Food had been very short. He had protested to UNRWA. Only dried food had been brought. For one month, he said, the only way to get fresh food for his patients was through gifts from the townspeople.

Dr. Habib said that the Hospital had been subjected to several night searches. He said the Hospital had not had antibiotics. The Israelis had not complied with requests for these medicines.

He said 27 of 35 doctors had been taken from the Hospital, when the Israelis arrested people on 7 June 1967, the effective staff included.

He said that he examined one body during the occupation, death having occurred, according to the Israelis, because the man was running away. He had found that a bullet had actually entered the body from the front. He did not know the name of the person.

Dr. Habib said that his civilian medical staff had never been charged before any court after the arrest. Most of the Palestinians arrested had been returned to the Hospital after six weeks, but the Egyptians had been kept, sometimes for six months.

During questioning, he said that among those arrested was Mohamed Derbas. He had been a male nurse at the Hospital and a normal man at that time.

Castration, he said, had taken place after his arrest.

Miss Hagazi, who said she was from El Arish, said that, on 24 June, Israeli soldiers had entered her house and shot her father and killed him, without any reason. She herself had been shot in the arm and leg.

Another man visiting her family, a neighbour, had been shot and killed, she stated.

Miss Hagazi said that this had occurred at 10 in the morning. There had been no curfew in effect.

She said that she had remained at home, without any treatment. She showed the Committee her artificial arm.

She said that they had not been allowed to bury the bodies of the two men.

The witness said that, after looting her house, the Israeli soldiers had left. For two days, nobody had come to see her or her family. Then, neighbours had come, she stated.

During the questioning, she said that her younger brother, 13 years old, and a younger sister, 10 years old, had hidden under the bed during the incident and had then escaped.

She said that the 12-year old daughter of a neighbour had also been shot on the spot and killed.

Miss Hagazi said that the two children who had escaped had come back with the neighbours after two days. Nobody had been able to come earlier, because of the curfew. She had then been taken to the hospital.

She said that the doctor who had treated her was the first witness, Dr. Gobrial. She had been in the hospital for four months. Her arm had been amputated.

She said that the neighbours had not been allowed to take the bodies in the house away for burial. While she had been in hospital, she said, the bodies had been buried in the house by the neighbours.

(more)

At the time of the incident, she said, her mother was away elsewhere in town visiting relatives.

She said that no Israeli soldier or authority had ever asked her about the incident. She had never been before a court official to give evidence of the case. She had never been asked anything about the incident while in the occupied territories.

Dr. Gobrial was recalled and retook the solemn declaration.

The Chairman said that, earlier, the witness had not mentioned the case of Miss Hagazi.

The witness said that he had mentioned general cases, not individuals.

During questioning, he said that he had treated the witness for four months. He had assisted during the amputation. The arm had been useless when Miss Hagazi entered the Hospital. It had been gangrenous and tetanus had set in. The neighbours who brought her had recounted what had happened and had stated that they had buried the bodies in the house.

After the questioning, he said that there had been many incidents, but that the case of Miss Hagazi was the severest that he knew of.

Mr. Darwish, who said he was Secretary of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and was appearing as a member of that body, said that a committee of his organization had been created in January 1968 to investigate the situation. Israel had refused to let the Committee go into the occupied areas. It had gone to neighbouring areas.

He presented the Committee with a report of his body's fact-finding mission to the Middle East.

Miss Kamilia Kamel Elzerbawi and Mrs. Menaawer Soliman Elzerbawi appeared together, and Miss Elzerbawi said she was 16 years old; the other witness was her aunt.

She said that her father was still in El Arish.

She said that Israeli soldiers had come into her house and shot her in the head and hands. There had been 16 people in the house at 9 o'clock in the morning when the incident occurred about 10 days after cease fire.

She said that the soldiers had fired at men, women and children in the house. Her aunt's husband and their two sons had been killed, she stated. She, her father, a younger sister and a female cousin had all been wounded by the firing, she said. There had been no reason for the shooting.

The soldiers had shot and left.

Miss Elzerbawi said she saw that her younger brother and sister had not been injured. Neighbours had taken her to the hospital next day. There had not been sufficient facilities to treat her and, after 15 days, she had been transferred to Gaza.

Miss Elzerbawi said that there had been about 15 or 20 soldiers involved in the incident. There had been no curfew at the time of the shooting. She had heard the soldiers searching other houses nearby, before they burst into her house.

She said the bodies were not allowed to be buried outside and had to be buried in the house. The neighbours had not been able to attend to the wounded, because a curfew had been imposed within about half an hour after the shooting. The witness said she had been told about this curfew afterwards.

The witness showed the Committee a scar on the right part of her skull, about two inches above the ear.

She was assisted to the Committee table, because she said her left arm was paralyzed and her left leg partially paralyzed, as a result of the shooting injuries.

Mrs. Elzerbawi, the aunt, said that the bodies of her husband and two children had been buried in the garden courtyard in the centre of the house. After six months, they had been allowed to have a proper burial.

She said the Israelis had never investigated the incident. She had told the Red Cross about the matter.

Dr. Elbark said he was a doctor who had been in El Arish at time of the hostilities. He knew Miss Elzerbawi.

He said he was present in the hospital when that witness was admitted. She had a fractured skull and a paralysis of the limbs. The condition had been 48 hours old. He had known her as a normal, healthy child before the incident.

Dr. Elbark said he had watched Egyptian troops being shot down by the Israeli soldiers while they had their hands up. He had been six metres away. He said that 23 Egyptian soldiers had been shot in this way on 7 June 1967.

There had been been a curfew for four days and only after that could the bodies be buried, he said.

He said that all but one of the mosques in El Arish had been demolished by the Israeli soldiers.

(more)

He gave the Committee the names of two people who, he said, had been stoned and then shot three months after the cease fire. One had died immediately, he said; the other later. He said he had seen the bodies.

He said that there had never been any case of an Israeli being brought before a court for any atrocities committed in El Arish. Anybody wearing khaki was shot, including civilian police and telephone operators. This had occurred during the nine months that he was in the town, he stated.

He said that he had never seen any Israeli soldier with any pity in his heart regarding the population.

He said he had told Red Cross officials about the incidents he had described.

Mr. Lotfi said he had been in the occupied territories for about three and half months after the occupation, at El Arish. He had been Director of Social Affairs there.

He said that there had been 1,000 bodies in the street at one time. They had been civilians.

Asked if they had died before or after the cease fire, he said it was afterwards.

He said that the Israelis had not brought any foodstuffs or other articles with them for the people when they entered El Arish. They had insisted on changing Koranic teaching in the schools and removing all references to Israel or Jews.

There had been a demolition of many houses, and forced labour was instituted, he said. Regarding forced labour, he added that people were made to collect anything that would be of military value, so that such articles could be transported to Israel.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/509
27 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN CAIRO ON 23 APRIL

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories continued its hearings of further witnesses in Cairo in two meetings on 23 April. All witnesses said they were either citizens of the United Arab Republic of Palestinians.

The witnesses heard included the following: Hamdi El Khalili, who said he was a lawyer and had been at El Arish until 24 April 1968; Mansi Selma Elgar, who said he had been a police sergeant at El Arish; Seliman El Yemani, who said he was the Sheikh of a tribe; Ismael Zikry, a Customs official from El Arish; Moheb Hassan Hussein, 15 years old, whose father, a merchant, was still in El Arish; Tewfik Hassan Wasfi, a Counsellor in the Arab League Office; Ahmed Abdullah El Malari, a fisherman from El Arish; Abdel Rahum El Damrani, the headmaster of an El Arish school; Rabei A. El Sherif; Mohammed Shaaben Elkasali, the Sheikh of a tribe called Fawakhribh; and Dr. Kamal Malak Govrial, a surgeon, who had been at the El Arish Hospital for a year and a half, until 16 September 1969.

Testimony of Witnesses

The first witness, Mr. KHALILI, said that Qaryit Nasser had been a model housing project of between 200 and 300 houses for farmers, about 2 kilometres from the centre of the town of El Arish. The inhabitants were forcibly removed in December 1967 and January 1968, he stated, and replaced by Israeli settlers.

(more)

On 7 February 1968, he said, his house had been entered late at night and he had been imprisoned with more than 30 other people. He had been released on 27 March 1968.

He said that four or five months after the occupation, the Israelis had confiscated and removed medical supplies from a charitable dispensary. They had taken over the agricultural co-operative and removed foodstuffs sufficient to feed the town for three months. This had occurred about six months after the occupation, he stated.

The witness said he was recounting incidents that he himself had seen.

Regarding his imprisonment, Mr. Khalili said that it was an Israeli policy to imprison civil leaders so as to intimidate others to evacuate the Sinai. He said this policy had succeeded in many cases.

He had not been able to move for 15 days because of mistreatment. Not even an aspirin was given to him. He said the food was insufficient for a dog.

By the time he left, he was the only lawyer remaining in El Arish, he said.

Mr. ELFAR, who said he had been a police sergeant at El Arish, said he had come to Cairo on 20 July 1967.

He said that, after cease fire, he had been shot in the thigh and had lost his left eye through a ricochet. His two-year old daughter had been shot and killed. The incident, he said, occurred when Israeli troops came to loot his home.

Mr. Elfar said that, while in Cairo, he had been told in a hospital by his wife that one of his sons had been killed by the Israelis after the looting incident.

He said the Israelis had entered his house the second time in September 1967, before the rest of his family left El Arish, and had taken away the son and shot him deed in the main street. This was what his wife had told him, he stated. She had come to Cairo in April 1968.

He said that, as the result of the shooting of himself, he had been in an Israeli hospital. The Israelis, he said, had wanted to amputate his leg. He had gone on a hunger strike and had complained to the Red Cross. As a result of the protest, he said, he managed to be transferred to Cairo.

(more)

He said his leg was not amputated because he received sufficient treatment in Cairo.

The witness took out his glass eye to show the Committee his eye socket. Final operation on the eye had been in 1969, he said.

The witness said that neither he nor his family had ever been interrogated by the Israeli authorities regarding the shooting incident. He had not told the Red Cross about it, because they never asked him, he stated.

He said there was no way to make complaints in the occupied territories. He gave the Committee the names of people who, he said, had witnessed the shooting of his son.

The Committee asked to hear the wife.

The witness said that she was not an educated woman, and that it was not customary to hear wives.

Subsequently, it was agreed by the witness to have his wife heard in a closed session.

Mr. YAMANI, who said he was the Sheikh of a tribe, said that, during the occupation, he had been in Bier Al Abid and Najila.

He said that, after the cease fire, the Israelis had ordered his tribe to leave their area. About 7,000 people had been involved. Before expelling the people, he said, the Israelis shot all the camels and other livestock.

Mr. Yamani said that, of all the tribes in the area, about 40,000 people had been expelled. Another 40,000 tribesmen remained in the Sinai, he thought.

He said that among the tribes expelled were the Swarkh, Dawaghra, Akharsa, Ayaida, Bily, Howeithe, and Tawira. (Phonetic spelling in each case.)

The witness said that the only water supply had been wells and the Israelis had poisoned them after a helicopter came over them, he stated. After the helicopter had treated the wells, he said, cattle drinking from them had died.

Asked if he had come across such wells himself, the witness said he himself had not seen the poisoned wells themselves. However, he said, he had seen filled-up wells after the tribesmen had covered them up because of the poisoning.

(more)

He said the expelled tribesmen were now spread out in other parts of the United Arab Republic. They had come without clothing. Many had died en route in the swamps of Port Said. They had left their area without food or water and had to trek across the desert and swamp about 60 kilometres. It took [illegible] days. The swamp area was about [illegible] kilometres in extent.

Most of those from his tribe who died in the trek had been old people and children. About 17 or 20 had died, he said. Many more had required medical treatment after the trek.

Mr. ZIKRY, who said he was a Customs official from El Arish, said that, on 8 June 1967, after the occupation, he had met the Israeli Governor and asked to remove the many bodies in the town. The Governor had refused and said the bodies should be given to the dogs to eat.

In July, he said, medical supplies had been moved to Israel and the dispensary building had been set up as a jail and torture centre.

On 13 July, the witness said, he had been arrested. His furniture had been demolished and his possessions taken.

He was accused of being Secretary of the Arab Socialist Union. He had replied that it was a civilian organization.

He had been interrogated for two nights. On 15 June, he had been taken to the desert and told he was to be executed. A squad of soldiers fired around him until he fainted.

He was then taken to Gaza Prison and put in the torture compound. He had then been beaten with sticks, whips and barbed wire.

The witness said that the torture had taken place for five hours in the company of five other people who suffered the same treatment. He stated that he spent three days without food. Beatings had taken place for 10 days, he said.

The witness said that he was in prison for 53 days. He had asked to see the Red Cross representative about 10 times, but the request was refused every time.

He was expelled from El Arish without being allowed to take his clothes, he said. He left on 10 February 1968 for Amman and, two days later, for Cairo.

(more)

He said that, in prison, he was refused permission to see his family, to have a lawyer or be tried. He said that the two Israelis who tortured him in Gaza had called each other "Ari" and "Siegel".

Mr. Zikry said that his family had come with him to Cairo.

MOHEB HASSAN HUSSEIN, who said he was 15 years old, said that his father was a merchant who was still in El Arish with his mother.

He said that his home had been looted by about 10 Israeli soldiers about two weeks after the cease fire. He had seen the soldiers beating his father and, when he protested, he, the witness, had been shot.

The Chairman noted that the witness showed marks of injury on his left breast, left waist and right groin.

The witness said that he had been taken to a hospital. He asked to be treated and had been hit with a gun butt by a soldier.

He was treated by a doctor, but most medical supplies were lacking in the hospital.

He said that he had been refused a request to see Red Cross officials. He had been in El Arish Hospital about two months. He had come to Cairo on 19 May 1968.

The witness said that he told an Israeli officer about being shot. He had told the witness to find the soldier who had shot him.

He said that he was 12 years old when shot.

In El Arish, he said, no one from the occupying authorities had questioned him about the incident.

Asked if he would go back to El Arish, he said when his country was freed again.

Mr. WASFI said he was a Counsellor in the Arab League Office. He had been in Arab Jerusalem in a similar position at the time of the hostilities. On the second day of the hostilities, he said, he had been arrested and placed in Ramleh Jail for eight months.

He said that he had first taken refuge in the Belgian Consulate, but the Israeli forces had entered despite the diplomatic immunity involved. He said that this was on 6 June.

(more)

The Deputy Belgian Consul had protested and been beaten. Arab Consuls taking refuge had also been taken away, despite their diplomatic immunity, he said.

Mr. Wasfi said that the Israeli Police Chief had said that the Arab Consuls were not prisoners, but hostages.

He said that the Arab Consuls had eventually been released in January 1968, through the intervention of Gunnar Jarring (the Secretary-General's Special Representative to the Middle East). This occurred during the exchange of military prisoners, even though the Consuls were not military personnel, he said. This had been one of the first things that Mr. Jarring had done when he came to the area, he stated.

He said the Committee must ask to see the prisoners in Ramleh Prison. He gave the names of those said to be tortured and imprisoned for life. He said that the Arab Consuls, including himself and those of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Saudi Arabia, had been held in prison.

Mr. EL MALARI said he had been in El Arish during the hostilities. He was a fisherman.

In October 1967, he said, he had been arrested and placed in a stinking lavatory for 10 days. Then, he said, his 15-year old son had been arrested as a hostage, so that the witness would not leave the area.

After his release, he said, he had complained to a Red Cross official called Issa in El Arish about the arrests and looting of his property.

He said he had been threatened with further punishment if he did not ensure that certain fishermen came from Badawi to El Arish. The fishermen's huts had later been burnt at Badawi. Israeli settlements had been built in their places.

He said that the Israelis had increased fishing taxes from four Egyptian pounds a year for a 27-man boat to about two and a half Egyptian pounds a month per person or 62 pounds monthly. He said that this prevented the fishermen from earning a livelihood. He had left El Arish on 29 April 1969.

(more)

Mr. EL DAMARANI said he had been the headmaster of an El Arish school. He said that two of his children, a 16-year old boy and an 11-year old boy, had been shot and killed by Israeli soldiers around 15 June 1967, when they had entered his house. He said that after shooting his children, the Israeli soldiers had left the house.

He had gone to see the Israeli commander and told him what happened. He asked for permit to bury his children, but the commander had refused, and said that he knew nothing about the incident.

Mr. El Damareni said that other children had been injured in the shooting, but he had not been able to get them to the hospital for three days. One daughter had had to have her arm amputated due to injuries.

The Committee asked to see the daughter. When she appeared, the Chairman noted that her entire left arm was amputated from the shoulder.

The Committee also asked to see a son said to have been wounded in the incident.

The Chairman noted the bullet wound in the son's right leg.

Mr. El Damarani said that the Israelis had wanted the schools opened with the use of an Israeli curriculum. He said that the teachers, as a group, had refused and made the decision known to the occupying forces. Because of threats, the teachers had left. All refused salaries from the Israelis.

The witness said that he never met any representative of the Red Cross. He had never been approached by an Israeli representative to investigate the shooting of his children. He said that the troops involved numbered about 15. No officer had been with them.

Mr. EL SHERIF said his son had been in El Kantara at the time of the hostilities. The son had in August tried to visit him in El Arish.

He said that, subsequently, his house had been raided by Israeli troops and he had been arrested and taken to Gaza Prison.

He had been tortured like the others, but he did not want to repeat what had happened to him.

Mr. El Sherif said that the interrogator had told him that his son was an Egyptian intelligence officer who had organized fedayeen attacks. He said that his son, who was 18 years old, had been brought in and beaten in front of him and he had been beaten in front of his son.

(more)

He had been told that he had been sentenced to six months in jail. He said he was afraid to speak now, because he thought the son would suffer. The son had been sentenced to life imprisonment. However, he had to speak, according to his conscience.

The witness said that, after leaving prison in October 1967, he had found his home destroyed and his children dispersed.

He had seen his son in Ramleh Prison in December 1967 in a deplorable condition. Marks of torture could be seen on the body. One of his nails had been pulled out.

He said that his son had exposed his body to the Israeli court to show the torture, but the court had not taken this fact into consideration.

The witness said that, in Cairo, he had told Marcel Boisard of the Red Cross his story. The Red Cross had sent a letter, he said.

The Chairman read a letter into the record. It was dated 14 May 1969, and stated that the son had been visited in Ashkalen Prison in April 1969 and had been found to be in good health, but depressed.

The Chairman said, for the record, that the witness heard was obviously broken by the bitter experience.

Mr. ELKASALI said he was the Sheikh of a tribe called Fawakhribh (phonetic spelling).

He had been in El Arish at the time of the hostilities. On 15 September 1967, he said, Israeli soldiers had told him and his family to leave his house without his possessions. His house and two others had then immediately been demolished. About 25 others had been demolished that day, he added.

He had walked through the desert for 15 days to reach Cairo. His family had later joined him in 1968, after an intervention by the Red Cross.

MOHAMMED ABDEL AMIR ELKAMD said he had been Supply Assistant in El Arish attached to the Education Department at the time of the hostilities.

He said that his mother had died about one and a half months after the hostilities, because there were no medical supplies with which to attend her wounds.

(more)

He had been arrested and accused of distributing pamphlets against the Israeli forces. He had been beaten with barbed wire on the face, he said.

He had been interrogated for five days by teams in relay.

He said that he had had wild dogs set on him. He had been tied to a vehicle and dragged five or six kilometres over stones.

He said that Israeli soldiers had fired on a number of prisoners. One man, whose name he gave the Committee, had been killed, he said.

He said that the wounded prisoners had then been released. He had gone to the hospital, he said.

He said that, in November 1967, he had escaped to Amman and then came to Cairo.

The Committee then heard further evidence by Dr. GOVRIEL, at the Committee's request.

He was asked if he knew Mr. Elnahb. He said that he had treated the latter's daughter, who then had been about 15 years old.

In answer to a question, he said that he had not been present during the afternoon testimony.

He said that the daughter's arm had been useless because of gunshot wounds and had been amputated.

He then identified the patient at request of the Committee.

The witness said he had also treated the brother for a leg wound caused by gunshot. He identified the boy.

He said, in reply to questions, that such cases as the present one were never brought to the attention of the Red Cross. He said he was not aware that any autopsies had taken place on people said to have been killed in similar incidents.

He thought the bullets used were "dum dum" bullets fired from a Sten. He had extracted bullets from patients eight to ten centimetres long.

* ***.*

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/510
27 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN CAIRO ON 24 APRIL

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories continued its hearing of witnesses in Cairo at two meetings on 24 April. All witnesses said they were either citizens of the United Arab Republic or Palestinians.

The witnesses heard on 24 April included the following: Soliman Fisal Abdel Malek, a Member of the Parliament of the United Arab Republic, representing the Sinai; Salem Aly El Hersh, a Sheikh of the Bayadeh tribe; Mrs. Mansy Salama Elfer of El Arish; Abdel Wahab Hussein El Sherif; Ismail Rashed Yakub, a fisherman; Miss Hoda El Abd El Hessy; Mohammed El Abd El Hessy, her brother; Mrs. Chalia Mohammed Housayen of Kantara; Mohammed Salem Mohammed Hassan, a fisherman; and Mrs. Sobha Soliman Emira.

Testimony of Witnesses

The first witness, Mr. MALEK, said he had been in Ingileh at the time of the hostilities, as an official in the Education Department.

He said that, in August 1967, the tribesmen of the area had been ordered to leave and to go to unoccupied Egypt. He had been removed from his tent by force, which was then burned by the Israeli troops. This occurred to 20 to 30 tents, affecting about 20 families of an average of five or six persons.

The families had to walk two nights and one day through the swamps of Port Said, he said. If the normal route was taken, he said, the journey could be done in six hours. He said that the tribesmen were deprived of all possessions and livestock.

(more)

He said that a Sheikh, a boy and a girl in his group had died in the trek. He gave the Committee the names.

He said that many more tribesmen had been expelled. When they had resettled, they had elected him as a Member of Parliament in January 1969. In the refugees' village in which he was there were 2,000 people. There were nine other such villages, encompassing a total of about 150,000 refugees, he said.

As the representative of the refugees, he had visited the various villages. He had seen those expelled in 1969.

He said that the Israelis were still expelling people, forcing them to march across the desert. The refugees said that Israelis forced the tribesmen to leave by cutting off food supplies and killing the children.

The Chairman asked how this was known about the children.

The witness said that the tribesmen had told him.

The Chairman said that this was hearsay evidence. He wanted direct testimony.

SALEM ALY EL HERSH said he was a Sheikh of the Bayadeh tribe (phonetic spelling) and he had been in Rebah (phonetic spelling) at the time of the hostilities. Four days after the hostilities, he said, the Israelis had gathered the entire tribe of about 500 persons and looted their tents of all valuables. The tribe had been expelled, he said, by being told to "go back to Abdel Nasser". Two men of the tribe had been shot. He gave the Committee the names.

Sheikh El Hersh said the Israelis said that they shot the two men because they had said they were members of the Egyptian Army. He said the men were not in uniform.

The witness said that some of the tribe had trekked through the Port Said swamps. He and about 300 or 400 others of the tribe had remained in some huts in the area for about 30 days.

He said that the Israelis had burned some huts and taken some of the livestock. Later, they took him alone to Hasassan and asked him and other Sheiks numbering about 24 from other tribes to sign a declaration approving Sinai's incorporation into the occupied territories. The Sheikhs had refused. He gave several of the names and tribes. The Sheikhs had been sent back to their homes, he said.

(more)

Then, he said, seven young men, including members of his family and from his tribe, were taken hostages. He did not know why. He gave the Committee their names.

The witness said that about three months later, he and about 80 people were expelled. About 300 people remained. Those expelled could not take any possessions with them. They had travelled by car to the King Hussein Bridge.

The witness said that, occasionally, letters were received through the Red Cross stating that the seven were still in jail. He said that none of the other Sheikhs he knew had been expelled. He was expelled because he was not co-operating with the Israelis.

Asked if this meant that the other Sheikhs were co-operating, he said he did not know.

Mrs. MANSY SALAMA ELFAR said she had been in El Arish at the time of the hostilities. She said that 20 days after the cessation of hostilities, her house was broken into by Israeli soldiers. Her husband had gone to see what was going on. Her two-year old daughter had followed him. They had been shot and the daughter killed.

Her husband was eventually taken to El Arish Hospital, she said. Three months later, in September, Israeli soldiers had broken into the home and taken one of her sons and had killed him.

She had not seen her husband again until April 1968 in Cairo, she said.

Regarding the shooting of her son, she said that no reason was given for taking him away. The soldiers beat him in the house and then took him on to the main road.

Her family and others were told to leave the houses, and about 20 houses were demolished, she said. Her own house was badly damaged by the demolitions.

The witness said that her son was first stoned and then shot and killed. She said she had not seen this. She had been told. The shooting had taken place on the same day that he had been taken. She had examined the body. On the following day, she had buried him.

With her son, she said, was a neighbour whose name she gave to the Committee. She said he had been stoned and shot, but had survived.

(more)

She said her husband had asked the Red Cross to get the family to Cairo. None of the Israeli authorities ever contacted her to investigate the incidents she had mentioned, neither had she complained, because she said this would be to no avail.

The witness said that the man with her son when stoned and shot, was in Cairo.

The Committee asked for arrangements to be made to contact him.

ABDEL WAHAB HUSSEIN EL SHERIF said that he had been accused of distributing pamphlets and throwing bombs. He had denied the charges.

He said that he had been beaten with barbed wire and one of his teeth broken. The beatings had gone on for 28 days, he said.

He was hanged by his hands from chains, with his feet dangling for half an hour, while the nail of his right toe was taken out.

He was expelled from El Arish when the Israelis could not prove the charge.

ISMAIL RASHED YAKUB said he was a fisherman. He, his brother and a cousin had been beaten in front of his family, while the Israeli soldiers looted his house in El Arish.

He said that he and his brother and cousin had been taken away and interrogated. He was beaten. A leather band was placed around his head and nose and squeezed until the nose bled. He could see and hear his brother being beaten.

He said that he had continually been asked about the whereabouts of Egyptian soldiers. He said he knew nothing about the soldiers.

He was released and re-arrested four months later, he said. He was accused of being a member of an organization that made clandestine broadcasts.

He showed scars on his wrists which, he said, was caused by being hanged from chains.

The witness said that electrodes were placed on his toes and another sensitive part of the body, and he was tortured through electric currents.

He spent three months in Gaza Prison, before going to Ashkelon Jail. He had been forced to stand in cold water in a cell with the windows open during the winter of January 1969.

(more)

Mr. Yakub said that he was released on 27 February 1969. Eventually, he came to Cairo through the Red Cross on 8 October 1969. However, he had never seen Red Cross representatives while in prison. He understood they had seen prisoners in other parts of the prison.

After his second arrest, he had been in prison for 13 months, without being tried. He had seen a lawyer, but was told he was under administrative arrest, "under Article 111".

Miss HODA EL ABD EL HESSY said she was 19 years old. She had been at the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) camp in Gaza at the time of the hostilities.

She said that the house of her family was looted by Israeli soldiers. She said that when people went to get food, the soldiers fired on them and some people were killed. This was after the Israelis had told the people that they could go and get the food. She said that she herself had seen 15 people killed on that occasion. She gave the Committee the name of one man said to have been shot and killed then, and said that he was a neighbour.

Miss El Hessy also gave the Committee the name of a boy said to have been shot and killed, while with his dead brother's body, and the name of a woman said to have been shot in the head and injured. The woman, she said, had lain in front of her house for three days bleeding because of the curfew. When she could be attended to, the witness said, she was found to be dead.

She said that, during the curfew in question, which was imposed for seven days, there had been no water. A neighbour had come to her house asking for water for her son who was said to have the measles. She had knocked at other doors, but there was no water.

Then, the witness said, the mother had gone to an Israeli soldier with a white flag asking for water, but he refused to help.

While the woman pleaded, she said the soldier had shot her in the chest. A neighbour had later pleaded with another Israeli soldier to have her taken to the hospital. Permission had been granted, she said. In the meantime, however, she said, the sick boy died. The mother had spent four months in the hospital and had survived, the witness said.

(more)

The witness then mentioned the following incident: During one incident, three soldiers, including a sergeant, had come to her family's house and twice tried to take her away. She and her neighbours had decided to complain to the Military Governor, because similar incidents had happened regarding women in the area.

All incidents she had recounted, including the killings, had been recounted to a man who heard the complaint. The Israeli had said that nothing further would happen to them, she said. However, later there had been further such incidents with the soldiers, she said.

She left the area in December 1969, with her mother and three brothers.

She said she was never allowed to complain to Red Cross officials, under the threat of being shot. She had not known any UNRWA officials to complain to.

She said the soldiers who had harrassed her had not been drunk. They had been quite normal.

She said the young men had all been taken away at the beginning of the occupation. Gradually, some returned through the intervention of the Red Cross.

MOHAMMED EL ABD EL HESSY, brother of the witness, said he was 16 1/2 years old.

He said that, at the beginning of 1968, Israeli soldiers had come to his family's house. He had been accused of taking part in a demonstration and had been beaten with another boy, who was younger.

He was taken to the Police station, where, he said, he found five or six other youngsters like himself. The interrogator had threatened to shoot him if he did not tell the truth, he said. He was also threatened with having his ear cut off. Eventually, the top of one finger had been cut off.

The Chairman noted that the witness showed that the middle left-hand finger had been cut off as far as the end of the nail.

The witness said that the interrogator had two stars on his uniform. He described him as short, fair-haired, with a beard, and in his thirties.

The witness said his finger had been dressed with iodine. Parts of his finger had been hanging on by a piece of skin, he said.

(more)

He had been interrogated again later that day, and then placed in a cell alone for six days. After four days, the same officer visited him and said that the Red Cross would visit him; but that he must not say how his finger had been cut. He had been told to say that he lost it in a demonstration.

On the fifth day, he said, Red Cross officials had come and he had not said anything. He said the Israeli officer had answered all questions. The whole interview had been in Hebrew, which he did not understand.

Later, he was released. He left the occupied area in December 1969, he said. He said he had seen five people being shot. He gave the Committee the names of two of the people who he said he had known. He said that the wireless had said that the curfew was over. This was done to get the people out of their houses, so that the Israelis could have some fun shooting them.

At this stage, the Committee recalled Miss El Hessy.

In reply to questions, she said she recalled the incident of the cutting off of part of her brother's finger. It had taken place, she said, about a month and a half after the occupation.

The Chairman said it was difficult to establish the date of the alleged incident. It seemed to have been placed variously in July 1967 and early 1968.

Miss El Hessy said she had not been to school. She did not know dates.

In reply to questions, she said that the incident had occurred after schools reopened, which was about two months after the occupation. Her brother's finger had been cut by the time of Ramadhan, she said.

The Chairman said that this did not fit in with the boy's evidence on the dates. Somebody was mistaken about the dates.

Miss El Hessy said it had been at the end of summer when the alleged incident had occurred.

Mrs. CHALIA MOHAMMED HOUSAYEH said she had been in Kantara at the time of the occupation. The town had been occupied one month after the hostilities, she stated.

She said that she had been home with her six children. The Israelis had told her to leave. She refused, and she said they had taken her possessions. When she refused again the next day when 10 soldiers came again, she said, a soldier had set fire to the inside of the house and thrown her six-year old daughter into the flames.

(more)

She said she left because she feared for her other children.

Mrs. Housayen said she had to leave her six-year old child so as to get out of the burning house with her other children. Her house was rather isolated. She had not noticed what was happening to the other houses.

The witness said she fled the town. So had most of the townspeople, she added. She and others had crossed into the United Arab Republic controlled territory through the swamps.

MOHAMMED SALEM MOHAMMED HASSAN said he was a fisherman from El Gis in the Sinai. He was there during the hostilities.

He had been fishing with five others, he said, when six Israeli soldiers had come and said that this was forbidden. They replied that it was their livelihood. They were then given 24 hours to leave or they would be shot.

He said that one of the soldiers had then taken an object, put it into his mouth and had then thrown it into the boat. He said that all his companions were killed. He had been injured.

The Chairman said that the witness had lost his right hand above the wrist, part of his right ear and also showed marks of injuries on the right shoulder.

The witness said he lost his hand immediately. It had been blown off, he said. He said he was picked up by Bedouins, and that he could go to a hospital in the United Arab Republic controlled territory. He had been in the hospital 65 days.

In reply to a question, he said that the boat had been about 10 metres from the shore. He said that, during the argument, they had left the boat and then had been told to get back in. Then, he said, the object was thrown into the boat.

He gave the Committee the names of the other people in the boat who had died. He said that, before the incident, he was never warned not to go fishing in the area.

Mrs. SOBHA SOLIMAN EMIRA said that Israeli soldiers had fired at her when they came to her house in Bir El Abd, and she had lost the sight of her left eye.

(more)

The Chairman noted that the witness showed a blind left eye.

The witness said she had other wounds on her body, which was not possible to be shown.

She said she had been treated at El Arish Hospital by an Arab doctor, whose name she did not know. The wounds only had been dressed. No operation had ever been performed, she said.

She said she had been all alone, when the incident happened. Her children had been at school and her husband had been in Cairo. The neighbours had taken care of her until the husband returned and, after two days, he had taken her to El Arish Hospital.

In reply to a question on how her husband had got to Bir El Abd, she said he had been able to come and go as he pleased.

She said that the alleged shooting incident had taken place about six months after the hostilities, while the soldiers were looting. After having been shot, she said, her house was burned down, as had the houses of others.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA — NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/511
28 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONTINUES HEARINGS IN CAIRO ON 25 APRIL

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories continued its hearings in Cairo at two meetings on 25 April. All witnesses heard said they were either Egyptians or Palestinians.

The witnesses heard included the following: Mrs. Narges Mohammed Ibrahim of El Arish; El Yamani Ahmed Hassan, also from El Arish; Deif Alla Ali Koulieb from Rammanah; Abdulla Gabril Elbeid, a school teacher from El Arish; Saleh Eish-Ibrahim; Moussa El Jayoussi, a lawyer from Nablus; Nabel Omar Abdel Samad Kandil, Mohammed Gad Ahmed El Saed, Said Ali Abdel Ghane and Mohammed Abdu Is Sayed Abd, who testified together; and Sheikh Souliman Moussi Ibrahim from Beir El Abd.

Testimony of Witnesses

Mrs. IBRAHIM, the first witness, said that Israeli soldiers came into her house in El Arish, and that her son was knifed, while the other members of the family were beaten with rifle butts.

She said that the family had been ordered to leave the area. Bracelets on her wrists were taken from her. She had been refused permission to take any possessions. The family came to the United Arab Republic controlled territory.

The Chairman noted that her son showed a scar on the right arm and had difficulty in flexing his arm.

The son said that he was bayonetted. He was now 10 years old.

Mr. HASSAN, who said he was also from El Arish, said that he had been with five other people who had been shot and killed by Israeli soldiers inside a baker's shop. He gave the Committee the names.

(more)

He said that he and the others had previously been working together for two or three years. He had been shot in both legs and he was taken to the hospital.

He asked to see the Red Cross, but he was told this was forbidden. He gave the Committee the names of the United Arab Republic doctors who had treated him at El Arish Hospital. He did not know where they were now.

The witness said that he had been in the hospital for two months. He had not been able to walk for a further month.

The Chairman noted that the witness showed scars of wounds on the left leg below the knee.

Mr. KOULIEB, who said he was from Rammanah, said he had been there at the time of the hostilities.

All the people had left the town at that time, he said.

On 10 October 1968, he said, an Israeli patrol had visited him at Ghahia and had asked for money. When he said he had none, a soldier threatened to shoot him. His family was beaten and his father and a cousin taken away. Up to now, he did not know where they were.

He said that the soldiers had shot and killed his two sons on the spot. Only he and his wife were able to leave the scene. All valuables were taken away from him and the house he was in was demolished.

Mr. Koulieb said that because of being beaten at this time he could no longer walk properly.

The Chairman noted that the witness had a large scar on his upper leg.

Mr. EBEID said he was a school teacher who had been in El Arish at the time of the hostilities. He had taught there in a boys' school of about 700 children.

He said that he stayed in El Arish through 15 months of the occupation, leaving on 16 September 1968.

He was arrested with 12 other teachers for refusing to co-operate with the Israelis on 1 October 1967 for two days and then released. He was arrested for refusing to co-operate with the Israelis or to accept their pay. The other teachers had been released at the same time.

(more)

He had been re-arrested on 7 February 1968 for refusing to open the schools. The other teachers also refused. On that day, he said, more than 30 people were arrested, but not any of the other teachers.

He said that he had been beaten in the prison at El Arish and had then been taken to Gaza Prison. He was again beaten until he bled from the nose, and one of his ribs was broken.

Mr. Ebeid said that he complained to the Red Cross about the treatment. He met representatives from this organization at Gaza Prison. The complaint had been made in private, without the presence of any Israelis, he said. He added that there had been two representatives of the Red Cross. He did not know their names. They had come in mid-February 1968, about three weeks after his arrest.

He said that he had never been tried, and had been released. He found his house designated for demolition along with 19 other houses. He had been forced to leave the area in September 1968, under a Red Cross escort.

Mr. IBRAHIM said that in 1967, after the Israeli occupation, he was living in Nagilam. In July 1967, his dwelling and about 100 other buildings had been burned down by Israeli soldiers. His family had left and lived in the mountains some time before.

He said that in 1968 an Israeli patrol had come upon his family and had raped his wife in front of him. She had died an hour later, he said.

He said that one of his children, a five-year old boy, had subsequently died, as had his daughter, while walking through the desert after being evicted. The daughter had been shot by an Israeli patrol, he said. The shooting occurred at Moussa Springs. He said there had been no witnesses, since only he and his daughter remained in the family at the time of the incident.

In another incident, he said, his 16-year old sister had been abducted by an Israeli soldier. She had not been seen since.

He said he reached United Arab Republic controlled territory in late 1969.

During the questioning, Mr. Ibrahim said that he and his family had been alone when his wife was raped. There had been just himself, his wife and two children. The wife had been about 25 years old.

(more)

He said the patrol had come upon them in an armoured truck. There had been about eight soldiers. The wife died of shock after being raped and after the patrol left. He buried her in the sand and left, he said.

The witness said that his son died of thirst and exhaustion.

Mr. EL JAYOUSSI said he had been in the occupied territories in Nablus until 25 October 1968, when he was expelled to Jordan.

He said he was not allowed to take any possessions. He had not been given any reason for the expulsion. He was a lawyer, he said.

He said that he had seen reports of torture.

The Chairman said that the Committee had seen many reports. It desired first-hand evidence.

During the questioning, the witness said that international law was not applied in the area. There had been a strike by lawyers because of this. The prime violation, he added, was the removal of the higher courts from the sites where they were supposed to be.

He said that taxes were placed on soap, edible oils and the products of craftsmen, which were not applicable before the occupation. In his view, the aim was to encourage the people to leave the area.

The lawyers had collectively protested this, he said. There had been no reply to the protest.

He said that the taxes were ordered by the Military Governor in a written notice on individuals.

Terrorization by shooting in the air, curfews and the prevention of movement of food products were common practices, he said. Collective arrests of whole villages and exposure for long periods in the sun and cold also occurred, he stated.

The witness said that he refused to practice law under these conditions. Of 23 lawyers in Nablus, he said, 21 refused to practice. The inhabitants co-operated with the lawyers and resorted to arbitration among themselves to settle differences.

He said that the local courts had no jurisdiction regarding the occupying authorities, and that there was, therefore, no legal recourse through the courts for the inhabitants of the occupied territories.

(more)

In 1968, he said, a woman doctor named Dr. Khyad had been accused of arms trafficking. The lawyers had raised the question as to whether the Israeli defence laws or the Jordanian defence laws applied. The military court involved refused to answer the question, he stated.

The witness said that women and children were often arrested. This was an example of actions taken which were not consonant with security requirements, in his view.

NABEL OMAR ABDEL SAMAD KANDIL, MOHAMMED GAD AHMED EL SAED, SAID ALI ABDEL GHANE and MOHAMMED ABDU IS SAYED ABD gave evidence together. All said that they had been privates in the United Arab Republic Army during the 1967 war.

On 7 January 1968, Mr. Kandil said, all four had been in uniform in the Sinai when they were lost after the June hostilities and had been wandering in the Sinai ever since then. They were not carrying arms. They had buried them, he said.

The witness said that there had been six soldiers together. They had avoided the Israeli forces because they had seen other soldiers being shot by the Israelis. They had hidden in trenches. They had been arrested near El Arish, after moving from the area where they had been hiding.

He said that the six had survived on canned goods from United Arab Republic stocks near the place they had been hiding, which had been at Baghdad in the Sinai Peninsula.

After the arrest, he said, the six were taken to Tel Aviv. The Israeli authorities had not recognized them as soldiers. They had been tortured. They were hung up in chains by the wrist.

Mr. Kandil showed the Committee marks on his wrist.

The Chairman noted that the slight marks were not in themselves evidence of hanging from chains.

Mr. Abd also showed his wrists.

The Chairman said that there was no mark of a serious injury.

Mr. Kandil said that the six soldiers were kept in a separate cell at the Intelligence Headquarters in Tel Aviv. He was tortured for 10 days.

(more)

He said that this consisted of being hung by chains and being beaten for about an hour a day, four times a day. After 10 days, he was asked to sign a declaration saying he was not tortured, he said.

The witness said that he was accused of being a member of the fedayeen organization and of training others.

Mr. Kandil said that the torturers had been two Majors. He did not know their names.

Mr. Ghane said that he had been beaten in Tel Aviv and kept in irons for 10 days. He was tortured by beatings with a rubber hose until he fainted and was compelled to sign a declaration that he was not tortured. He had then been transferred to Jericho Prison.

Mr. El Saed said that, besides being beaten, he was burned by cigarettes. He showed the Committee scars on his arms and legs, which, he said, were caused by cigarette burns.

The Chairman noted that there were very superficial marks on the arms. He said that the witness also showed bruises on his legs. He said that the bruises were the same that might be seen on a rugby player after a game.

Mr. Kandil said he was transferred to Nablus Prison, where he was beaten, but not as seriously as at Tel Aviv. He was told that he and some others were being held under "Law Number 111", and would not be considered as prisoners of war.

During questions, Mr. Kandil said that he and his companions did not have identity cards with them at the time of the arrest, because they had torn them up. He said they had been refused access to the Red Cross.

Mr. Abd said that in Nablus Prison he had contracted an illness and had required an operation on his leg. In the hospital, an Arab male nurse had told a Red Cross representative that there were Egyptian soldiers who wanted to see him. He said that the Israelis had tortured the male nurse when they found out what he had done.

In further evidence in the afternoon, the witnesses said that they told the Red Cross representatives what had happened to them, but the Red Cross had not been of any use to them. The Red Cross representatives had been seen in Nablus Prison after they were five months in that prison.

(more)

It was stated that, after a transfer to Ramleh Prison, beatings had taken place every day. Three months later, the witnesses said, they were sent back to Nablus Prison and then to Askhkalon Prison, from where they were repatriated to the United Arab Republic.

The Chairman asked the witnesses if they wished to give testimony in a closed session.

They said that they did not.

The Chairman asked if they had anything of a delicate nature that they would wish to mention in private.

The witnesses said that there was not.

The Chairman said he would recount what torture the witnesses had said they had undergone in prison. He said that testimony had been given to hanging by wrists, being beaten and being burned by cigarette butts. He asked if the witnesses agreed that what he had recounted was the worst they had suffered.

The witnesses agreed with his summing up.

Mr. Kandil said that, while in the infirmary, he had been given enemas of red hot peppers.

The Chairman said he had repeatedly asked if there was anything further. Now, the witness mentioned this.

The witness said he did not regard this as connected with torture.

The Chairman asked if he regarded it as treatment.

The witness said he did not. He said that the treatment had aggravated his condition. He had bled from the arms the same week as he received the enemas. He said the enemas had been given with the intention of causing pain. He said the male nurse treating him had not known what was the correct treatment to give.

He said that, when he asked for medical treatment, dogs had been set on him. He added that there were things he could not say, except in closed session.

The Chairman said he had asked if a closed session was wanted, and the witnesses had refused.

Mr. Kandil said that he had refused a closed session before, because he had not wanted to say certain things. He now felt he had to give his testimony.

(more)

The hearings then went into a closed session.

When open session was resumed, the Committee heard SHEIKH SOULIMAN MOUSSA IBRAHIM, who said he was from Beir El Abd. His daughter, three years old, and his grandson, four years old, had been killed by a flame thrower. This had occurred on 10 June 1967, he said.

Sheikh Ibrahim said that his people had been expelled from their tribal area. Some 200 families, numbering about 400 people, had been involved, he said. The tribe involved was Rabiyah (phonetic spelling), he added.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/512
29 April 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES CONCLUDES HEARINGS IN CAIRO

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories concluded its hearings in Cairo on 27 April after further witnesses had been heard. The hearings in that capital began on 22 April.

At the close of the final hearing in Cairo, the Chairman, H.S. Amerasinghe (Ceylon), stated that the Committee had heard a total of 144 witnesses, including 49 in the United Arab Republic.

Witness Heard

DARWISH MUSTAFA ELFAR, one of the final witnesses heard in Cairo, said he had been in Sinai doing geological surveying at the time of the hostilities. For 22 years, he went on, Arabs had been appearing before committees such as the present one, but the conscience of the world had not yet been aroused to the nature of the new anti-semitism of Israel.

He asked the Committee not to differentiate between physical and psychological torture. As for physical torture, he said he had suffered less than others. A cousin of his had been shot for no reason, he added. Another cousin, he said, had lost an eye and a leg.

Mr. Elfar said that Israelis had broken into his house in El Arish on 7 January 1968 and had arrested him. His watch had been taken and then returned. The witness's purse had also been given back.

(more)

In the car taking him away, he said, one soldier kept saying "Fateh, Fateh, Fateh". He said he had not replied. At the headquarters, he said an interrogator had said: "All your gang is captured". He had denied being a member of Fateh.

He said he had been taken to another place. He, his family, President Nasser and the Prophet had all been cursed, he said, and he was spat upon by soldiers.

Mr. Elfar said he had then been taken to a third place. He had been accused of being a spy, he stated. He was then told that he was going to Tel Aviv, where he would be hanged, he asserted.

The witness said he was mistreated, so that his nose and forehead bled and his glasses were broken, in a Gaza jail. He was asked to sign a paper agreeing to being held for one month.

The Chairman, Mr. AMERASINGHE, said he did not understand the purpose of such a paper. He could not see any advantage in it.

The witness, Mr. ELFAR, stated that the interrogator said he had marked certain co-ordinates on a map. He had replied that that was for a Red Cross investigator to know where certain bodies were.

He said he had seen the results of torture on some people while in jail.

The Chairman said he was not doubting the witness' testimony. However, many details were given to the Committee alleging torture. If the witness did not have the names, such evidence was not required from him.

The witness said he was released on 1 May 1968 on a promise to go to work for the Israelis. He made the promise to get out of jail, but had not fulfilled it.

In reply to questions, he said his 14-year-old male cousin, whose name he gave, had been shot three months after the occupation. He had been taken from his house with another boy, placed against a wall 200 metres or so from the witness' house and shot dead. The other boy, whose name he gave, had escaped with a head wound.

He said the Israelis had asked him to be the Director of Education when they released him from jail.

(more)

In prison, he said he had met members of the Red Cross, including one called Ansch who had come three or more times.

He said that after serving one month, he was informed of the extension of his imprisonment. Israeli law allowed this extension for a period of up to nine months, he stated.

Another Witness Heard

GAMAL HASSAN AYESH said he had been in Gaza at the time of the occupation, working as a teacher in a government secondary school. He said he had been imprisoned twice, and tortured. He had been taken from a house in Beninein on 18 September 1967 when visiting the area and had been taken to the Khalil jail.

He said he had been interrogated by Major Abu El Nour, who accused him of being a saboteur. He had denied this, he said, and had shown his permit to visit the area.

For 20 days, he went on, he had been in this jail, where he was spat upon and kicked in the stomach. He had then spent 45 days in a Gaza jail before being transferred to Sarafand.

Mr. Ayesh said he was there for 20 days. He was tortured throughout the time, he stated. Some people had died there, and others had lost their minds, he said.

He left with partial paralysis in his hands, he said. He had recovered.

He said he was first beaten with sticks on every part of his body, without exception. He mentioned being beaten on his ears and his head being knocked on the wall. He was told, he said, that he belonged to Fateh.

The witness said he was then hanged by both hands, in the nude, from the cell window and was beaten with sticks, particularly on the sensitive parts of his body until he was unconscious.

Mr. Ayesh said he was kicked in the head while blindfolded and his limbs were tied. He was then hanged by the legs in the same way that he had been hanged by the arms. He said he was cut with knives. He was then stretched by an instrument until he felt his hands would be dislocated. This was done, he said, until he lost consciousness and then it was repeated. He had been

threatened with castration, he stated. He was taken to the operating room when he had fainted. He had examined his body when he came to and found he had not been operated on, he said.

The witness said he was then taken to the Gaza prison and released after five days. He said he had not been charged with anything during his 90 days or so in prison.

Mr. Ayesh said he was imprisoned again on 1 November 1968, until 20 December 1968. He was arrested while walking in the street and taken to the Gaza prison, he stated.

This time, he said he had not been tortured severely.

The witness said that, as a teacher, he was ordered to replace some 72 textbooks or have them changed. Students refused to accept the Hebrew curriculum, he said. The teachers supported the pupils. They were asked to sign an agreement to change the curriculum.

He said that the Israeli arithmetic books stated such sums as: the Fedaheen killed five Israelis and then another five; how many Israelis were killed? The witness said he searched through textbooks and was unable to find an example.

He said history books were completely replaced, as was all teaching about the Arab community. The aim was to make sure that pupils knew nothing about Palestine and to inculcate the pupil with the idea that the area belonged to Jews from all over the world.

Mr. Ayesh said that Israeli soldiers had thrown a bomb into the schoolyard during the recreation period. Israeli soldiers and tanks came into the school at this time, around the end of January 1968, he stated.

Israeli soldiers drove pupils into classes and in each class there were two Israeli soldiers who beat the pupils with sticks, he said. Three teachers and the headmaster were also beaten.

He gave the names to the Committee.

Mr. Ayesh said some pupils had to jump from second-floor windows to escape beatings. Some received broken arms and one, a broken back, he stated. The pupils in the school were from 14 to 17 years old.

(more)

He said Israeli soldiers came more than once and on each occasion they beat pupils. The pupils had gone on strike, he said, to protest the change of the curriculum that had taken place.

He said the occupying authorities had made a partial retreat and had withdrawn the demand for a change in the curriculum. Some of the pupils joined the Palestine resistance, and the Israelis were frightened by this and withdrew their demand to change the curriculum, he said.

The witness said that the teachers had formed a committee to meet with the Military Governor of Gaza and North Sinai, Mr. Chour, to protest against the army's entering the school, the six-day curfew and the detention of some pupils.

He said he had seen a girls' school of about 90 pupils entered by Israeli troops. The girls were beaten, he said. This had occurred about two weeks after his own school was entered. He said he had visited some of the girls in the hospital.

He gave the names of two persons, now in the Gaza prison, who met Moshe Dayan when he came to the area, he said. One, he said, was a teacher at a school conducted by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. He had known both personally.

The witness said the two persons had been told by Dayan that they should convince refugees to leave and go to the West Bank. He said the two persons had refused.

The Chairman asked what had happened. The witness said the two persons were now in prison.

Mr. Ayesh said all persons in the area were required to carry identity cards issued by the occupying authorities and were required to have them available for identity at all times, to be produced to any Israeli personnel who required them. He said that carrying identity cards was not enough, however. When arrested, a detainee was required personally to prove that he did not belong to Fateh, he stated.

The witness gave to the Committee the names of Israeli intelligence officers who, he said, had interrogated him.

(more)

He said he left Gaza on 25 June 1969. After leaving prison the second time, he was called for interrogation several times and was questioned about the activities of Fedaheen and threatened with torture, he stated. He had asked for permission to go to Amman. This was given. He had taken his family there and had never returned to Gaza.

He said that when interrogated, a lie detector was used on him. After this, the Israelis had accused him of lying.

Mr. Ayesh said he did not know anybody who had complained to the Red Cross about the Israelis going into the schools. He had never seen anybody from the Red Cross in the area.

Statements by Other Witnesses

EZZEDDING FODA said he was appearing as the Secretary-General of the Egyptian Society for International Law. He said he had previously given evidence before the Committee of six regarding Israeli regulations in occupied territories and concerning Geneva Conventions. He had received more recent information.

He said that new regulations still contravened the fourth Geneva Convention relating to civilians in occupied areas. He said that Israel did not have sovereign rights in occupied areas. Israel had no right to change the original laws of the occupied areas.

Mr. Foda presented to the Committee what he said was a copy of new Israeli Army Defence Regulations regarding Occupied Territories. He said the document did not mention the scope of the regulations in regard to time or place. He gave details from the document and a commentary on certain articles.

Mr. Foda also submitted to the Committee what he said were the original Israeli Army Defence Regulations regarding Occupied Territories.

The Chairman said that the Government of the United Arab Republic would be asked to provide copies of the law existing before the occupation in the areas now occupied.

FAYEZ SAYEGH said he was a consultant to the Kuwait Government and was appearing as a representative of that Government at its request.

(more)

He said he had not been to the occupied territories and did not have first-hand evidence. He wished to supplement, from desk studies, the testimony of previous witnesses regarding practices in occupied territories by attempting to put it into some kind of context.

Mr. Sayegh said that collective punishment did not seem to have been studied in depth. He said this was the punishment of people known to be innocent for actions that had been taken by other people. He said that collective punishment had been practised by the Israelis since the beginning of the occupation, though it was not admitted until 4 November 1969.

He said that on that date, Moshe Dayan was quoted in Israeli newspapers and in British and United States newspapers as having stated, in effect, that if people of occupied territories did not actively participate against the resistance, life would be made unbearable for them.

In November 1969, he said General Dayan had elaborated on this in a series of press conferences. He quoted from them and from other Israeli authorities on the same point.

Mr. Sayegh said that mass destruction of property was the main collective punishment. Curfews, bricking up shop entrances and prevention of travel were other such punishments, he said.

What controversy had erupted in Israeli government circles had not been over policy but over the usefulness of announcing it and the terminology to be used, such as substitution of the term "collective punishment" by the term "neighbourhood policies", he stated.

He said that whatever the name the policy had, it was contrary to the Geneva Convention, particularly Articles 31, 33 and 57.

In his view, it was ironical that this policy was practised by people who 25 years ago had refused a British request to inform on terrorists by saying that it was British law that was wrong not the actions of terrorists.

Mr. Sayegh said it was the occupation itself that was the supreme violation of human rights in occupied territories. It was the end and the means of the violations, and itself a violation.

(more)

He said it would be stated that all occupations were cruel. However, he said that what was acceptable before the United Nations Charter and the Geneva Conventions was not acceptable now. Also, he said, national policy was involved.

He said it was not an Ad Hoc response to provocation but State policy aimed at making the civilian population docile and crushing their spirit to resist and also at inducing a mass exodus.

Mr. Sayegh said this policy was a constant of Zionism since it was first conceived.

The Chairman thanked the witness for attempting to explain the philosophy of the occupation.

Comments by Government Spokesman

AHMED KHALIL, speaking on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Republic, thanked the Committee for its work. He said that only the "tip of the iceberg" had been touched regarding the number of victims. He said he was aware that the Committee's mandate did not cover the bombing and napalming of civilians, including school children. He hoped, however, that through the Committee, evidence of systematic torture and collective punishment would reach the world.

Statement by Chairman

The Chairman thanked the United Arab Republic Government for its co-operation and witnesses.

He noted that the Committee had now heard 144 witnesses, including 49 in the United Arab Republic. He said that many of the witnesses were of humble circumstances and had come before the Committee at great personal inconvenience.

He said their evidence would be evaluated, and he hoped the Committee would be of some service to humanity.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/513
1 May 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN GENEVA

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, which concluded hearings in Cairo on 27 April, began hearings in Geneva yesterday, 30 April. Appearing before it were Claude Pilloud and F.P. Payot of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The Committee was scheduled to meet again at 10:30 a.m. on 1 May to hear a witness who has come from Israel.

The Chairman, H. S. Amerasinghe (Ceylon), said the International Committee of the Red Cross was in a unique position regarding its established impartiality and integrity.

Statement by Mr. Pilloud

Mr. Pilloud said he had brought copies of various reports of his organization, with chapters on activities in territories occupied by Israel, covering the period from the occupation in 1967 through the first six months of 1969. He said a report on 1969 as a whole would be available shortly and would contain reference to the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross in respect of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

He also referred to a document he had presented to the Special Working Group established by the Commission on Human Rights to consider alleged violations by Israel of human rights in occupied territories.

Mr. Pilloud said the International Committee of the Red Cross had an important delegation of 12 to 15 persons, helped by locally recruited personnel, in the occupied territories. There were also delegations in the neighbourhood, and these delegations worked together, for example, on the question of repatriation.

(more)

He said the International Committee of the Red Cross tried to help wherever it could, including the visiting of prisoners of war and people detained or interned for acts relating to the occupation; helping those members of the population who needed help; delivering messages, now numbering nearly two million, between separated families; visiting the cease-fire areas for repatriation and exchange of persons; and provision of medical care. He said, regarding the Geneva Convention, that Israel had "not taken a very clear attitude" regarding their applicability to the occupied territories.

In reply to questions, he said his organization visited all prisons and camps known to them in Israel and the occupied territories regarding inhabitants of the occupied territories. Israel had given a list to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

see Correction next page

He said in reply to further questions that the International Committee had published a list of the institutions visited. They visited "all regular institutions where people are detained", he stated. However, he said, "there is a gap between the time of arrest and movement to a regular camp".

The Chairman said that witnesses had said that Srafand could not be visited. Mr. Pilloud said "yes, that is correct".

Asked if the International Committee of the Red Cross believed it should visit detention camps, Mr. Pilloud read from the text of the Convention and said that it should speak for itself.

In reply to another question, the witness said this was the first time since the Convention came into effect that it was being applied to occupied territories, other than for a brief period in the India-Pakistan war.

He said, in reply to a question that, sometimes, the International Committee of the Red Cross did not have immediate access to some prisoners without witnesses being present.

Mr. Pilloud said the International Committee's contention was that the Convention as a whole applied with regard to the Israeli occupied territories.

When the International Committee was refused access to a person, he stated, the reason given was always "security". He said this reason was given "for a short, temporary time, before access was always given" following a request of the International Committee.

He said that to the International Committee, the important thing was to see the person concerned. Wherever a State said "the question of applicability is open", difficulties arose, he stated.

(more)

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/513/Corr.1
4 May 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES BEGINS HEARINGS IN GENEVA

CORRECTION

In Press Release HR/513, issued on 1 May, the third paragraph on page 2 (concerning statements by a representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross) should read:

He said in reply to further questions that the International Committee had published a list of the institutions visited. They visited "all regular institutions where people are detained", he stated. However, he said, "there is a gap between the time of arrest and movement to a regular camp". In all countries, this is so, he added.

* *** *

The question of interpretation was difficult, he went on. The International Committee had opposed Article 5 of the Convention, but the Governments had accepted it.

He agreed with the Chairman that Article 5 was "a regrettable escape clause".

Asked if refusals to allow prisoners to be seen had seriously impaired the functions of the International Committee, Mr. Pilloud agreed that the situation was that the escape clause had not interfered with its functions "to a serious extent".

He said the International Committee visited each prison once a month. When in the prison, the delegate could ask to see a particular person without designating in advance a prisoner it wanted to see. It did designate in advance when it wanted to go to a particular prison.

The witness said, in reply to further questions, that interviews took place without the presence of a warder. He said interpretation was a difficulty. Usually a person among those detained could be found to interpret from the Arabic. It was not set policy, he agreed, to take along an International Committee for the Red Cross interpreter. It was not always possible to find such an interpreter, he stated.

In his view, the best method was to find a detainee who could help the other detainees regarding interpretation.

The Chairman asked if it was possible to have access to reports of 26 February 1968 on the Nablus prison and of 12 May 1968 on the Jericho prison, if they had been made public. The witness said reports on such matters were not public documents.

Mr. Pilloud said, in reply to a request by the Chairman, that by the end of May, the Committee would be given a copy of the report on the International Committee's activities for 1969.

In reply to a question, Mr. Pilloud said he himself had not visited Israeli prisons since the occupation in 1967. He had been appointed to give available information to the Committee.

The Chairman asked to have access to people who had actually been visiting the area, since certain specific evidence had been presented to the Committee and, the Chairman said, it was necessary to establish certain facts. He said all the Committee wanted to know was if certain statements had been made.

(more)

Mr. Pilloud said he would have to consult his Committee on this. He said the main task of the International Committee was to help the people concerned, and it would continue to do so.

It was stated that the identity of Mr. Monod and Mr. Conveir of the Red Cross had been mentioned by witnesses, and also an unnamed predecessor of Mr. Monod. A request was made for information regarding these persons.

Mr. Pilloud said the files would be consulted on the matter.

The Chairman said the Committee realized the awesome responsibilities of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

* *** *

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA — NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/514
1 May 1970

ISRAELI PRACTICES COMMITTEE HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE IN CAIRO

(The following cable, delayed in transmission, was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories held a press conference in Cairo, United Arab Republic, on 28 April. The three-member Committee concluded its hearings in that city on 27 April.

Chairman's Opening Statement

In an opening statement at the press conference, the Chairman of the Committee, H.S. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon), said the Committee had now heard 145 witnesses. In Geneva, the Committee would hear evidence from people living in Israel who had responded to the Committee's paid notices. The placing of the paid notices was clear evidence of the Committee's desire to hear anybody with evidence relevant to the subject of the matter of the Committee's mandate.

He stressed this, he said, because it had been suggested that the Committee only wanted to hear witnesses antagonistic to Israel. This was not so, and he emphatically refuted such a suggestion. The Committee had taken every precaution to ensure all evidence was heard regarding its investigation. Anybody with evidence regarding the Committee's work was free to come before the Committee. If certain parties, for whatever reason, declined to come before the Committee, the responsibility rested squarely on their shoulders for not giving evidence.

The Chairman said that in Geneva the Committee would also hear representatives of the Red Cross and the International Commission of Jurists.

(more)

Mr. Amerasinghe said there are many international organizations dedicated to the cause of human rights and he hoped they would give their full co-operation to the Committee. The Committee's opinion was that the cause of human rights was best served by giving evidence fearlessly. However noble the motives, the Committee did not believe the suppression of truth or facts served the interests of human rights. The Committee did not want comment from such bodies but facts. The Committee itself would decide if evidence was credible or not.

He said the Government of Israel still persisted in trying to veto the Committee's work. However, the Committee assured world public opinion that nothing would deter it from investigating the situation to the fullest possible limit and to the best of its ability.

He said he did not subscribe to the proposition that the visit to the occupied territories was absolutely indispensable. That proposition implied that there could be no investigation or findings unless permission was given to visit those areas. If that proposition were accepted, the Committee would play into the hands of those wishing to frustrate its investigation.

Replies to Questions

Replying to questions, the Chairman said it was not useful at the moment to identify the persons coming from Israel to testify before the Committee. Nor would he give the number.

Asked if the Red Cross tried to evade meeting the Committee, the Chairman said he did not say that. The Red Cross seemed to think it fitting to meet the Committee at a proper place which, in its view, should be in Geneva.

Asked if the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) had co-operated with the Committee, he said it was felt that decisions in this matter should be taken at Headquarters and not in the field.

Regarding UNRWA, the Chairman expressed surprise at some evidence given by teachers about UNRWA schools. He said the situation might have been very uncertain at that time, but he could not imagine that UNRWA would abandon certain camps and schools without continuity of administration. This matter required the Committee to pursue it carefully at the United Nations.

(more)

Asked about the grounds for Israel's opposition to the Committee, Mr. Amerasinghe went over points mentioned by Israel in its letter to the Committee declining to co-operate. He said the Committee had agreed wholeheartedly with Israel that the cause of human rights was indivisible. However, this did not mean that such a view should impair the work of a committee in a particular area if this were required by the General Assembly. In the occupied territories there was nobody to protect the inhabitants except the occupying Power. If someone wanted to insist on an investigation of the position of Jewish or other minorities elsewhere, the matter could be brought before the United Nations. He said peace, like human rights, was indivisible but it did not follow that efforts should not be made to bring about peace in one area if peace was not attainable elsewhere.

A correspondent asked the Committee why it interrogated and then cross-interrogated witnesses. It seemed to him that the Committee sometimes regarded witnesses as criminals. The Committee, said the correspondent, sometimes had given the impression that it did not believe witnesses.

The Chairman said that cross-examination did not imply this belief. The Committee was trying to resolve doubts or to make certain of particular facts. In other cases it cross-examine witnesses to establish references made in earlier testimony.

To a question whether the General Assembly would adopt a resolution on the Committee's report, Mr. Amerasinghe said that that was up to the Assembly. He did not know where in the Assembly's agenda the Committee's report would be discussed. He said the Committee was required to report as and when necessary. However, he said, he hesitated to predict the Committee's future. Any fresh cases should be communicated to the Committee at United Nations, New York.

Asked if Israel's non-co-operation had impaired the Committee's work, he said it had not. All evidence had been published after each meeting in press releases of the Office of Public Information (OPI). However, even that procedure had been criticised by the Israeli Government, which accused OPI of being an instrument of Arab propaganda. The Committee believed the publication of evidence before an investigating committee was essential feature of a fair hearing. Such publication should help the Israelis themselves. Anybody could read the evidence and refute it if he wished.

* *** *

U N I T E D N A T I O N S

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/515
4 May 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES HEARS WITNESSES IN GENEVA

Concludes Session; Scheduled to Meet in New York, 14-21 June to Hear Further Witnesses

(The following was received from a United Nations Information Officer accompanying the Committee.)

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories concluded its current session on 2 May after hearing further remarks in Geneva by a representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Earlier, on 1 May, the Committee heard further witnesses at its meetings in Geneva.

The Committee will hold another session at United Nations Headquarters to hear more witnesses and consider the drafting of its report, 14-21 June.

Comments by ICRC Spokesman

At the meeting on 2 May, further information was given to the Special Committee by Claude Pilloud of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Mr. PILLOUD first made a statement in open session, and then the Committee went into closed session.

Mr. Pilloud said a "communique" (Press Release HR/513 issued in New York on 1 May) had been issued, purporting to sum up what he had previously said (on 30 April) in the Committee. He said it contained several inaccuracies and did not fully reflect what he had stated. He said the "communique" had been issued without consulting him.

(more)

The Chairman, H.S. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon), stated that it was standard policy for the Office of Public Information to issue a press release on the hearings of the Committee immediately after a meeting had taken place. It was not policy to consult those appearing before the Committee as to the contents of the press release.

Mr. PILLOUD first commented on a sentence in the press release reading: "He said, regarding the Geneva Convention, that Israel had not taken a very clear attitude regarding their applicability to the occupied territories."

Mr. Pilloud said he had been referring at that stage to a report of the ICRC to the effect that Israel had at the time said that the question of applicability of Article 4 should be kept open for the moment.

Regarding references in the press release to questions of visits to detainees at the time of arrest and the question of interpreters and the question of choice of prisoners to be visited, he said his remarks had been of a general character and not, in particular, applicable to Israel.

Mr. Pilloud said regarding references to Sarafand that he said that this prison did not appear on the list of establishments contained in its reports regarding the visits, especially for the first six months.

Mr. Pilloud said he also considered inaccurate the references regarding witnesses being present at some times when Red Cross officials visited those detained. In his view, the references in the press release to this particular matter were incomprehensible.

Subsequently, after questions by the Chairman, Mr. Pilloud said the references in question sounded better in English than in French.

Mr. Pilloud also stated his view that the press release should have reproduced Article 5 of the Convention in full.

The Chairman said he assumed that anybody reading the press release would also consult the text of the Convention.

The Chairman said he recalled that he had asked if Article 5 was "a regrettable escape clause", a reference quoted in the press release.

The Chairman said he had also understood that Mr. Pilloud in his earlier testimony had stated that on certain occasions, witnesses were present when Red Cross officials met with detainees.

(more)

The Chairman said the recordings of what Mr. Pilloud had earlier stated to the Committee would be consulted, in line with the remarks just made by Mr. Pilloud.

The Special Committee then went into closed session.

Statement by Gideon Weigert

Meeting on 1 May, the Special Committee first heard GIDEON WEIGERT, who said he lived in Jerusalem and was an Israeli national and a journalist.

He said he had begun his Arabic studies in 1939, graduating in such studies. He had been a correspondent with the Palestine Post (now the Jerusalem Post) from 1945 to 1948. From 1948 to 1967, he had continued his study of Arab questions, including the economic and social side, while continuing as a journalist.

Many people in Israel, he said, had followed with great interest the reports of the Committee's work. He had studied them carefully and had found they presented a shocking picture of willful killings, mass rape and pillage. He said he hoped to open the eyes of the Committee even at this late date to what was really going on. He said the reports carried by the world news agencies gave a picture "that is false, that is distorted".

He said the witnesses appeared to fall into two classes: refugees from the course of the fighting or emigrés coming out in the period immediately following the fighting. He said that every one of these had signed a statement saying that he was leaving on his own accord, with no pressure having been brought to bear. The second group, he said, were people expelled for acts of terrorism and sabotage or for encouraging such acts.

Mr. Weigert said the evidence presented to the Committee had been with the full consent, blessing and approval of the Arab countries. There had been, in his view, a common aim in besmirching Israel and the more this was done, the better the evidence.

The Chairman interrupted to say that he did not want witnesses commenting on the credibility of others.

The witness said he came with neither the approval "and surely not the blessing" of the Israel Government. He said he did not come to idolize the Israel Government, and in his writing he had praised the Government where necessary and criticized the Government where necessary.

(more)

He said he had spoken to hundreds of Arabs in the course of his work, had entered their homes and eaten and slept with them, in towns and villages and refugee camps. He said there had been rises in the standard of living of the Arabs in the occupied territories in the last three years, and he had statistics on this.

The witness said that in his evidence, he would take the Committee on a trip to the occupied territories.

The Chairman commented that the Committee would like to go themselves on such a trip, not necessarily in the company of the witness or anyone else. He said this was no reflection on the witness; he merely wished to make this comment.

The witness then read from a series of articles in the Israeli press, several of which had been written by him. He had quoted a number of people who, he said, were Arabs living in the occupied territories, in his articles. In each case, he added, they had had no objection to the publication of their names, and, in most cases, had agreed to their photographs being printed.

The articles referred to increased fishing catches by Arab fishermen; expanded handicraft industry; increased sales of cigarettes; large expansion of agriculture; changes from low-income crops, such as melons, to tobacco and cotton crops; and expansion of chocolate manufacture.

The witness said he would then sum up the evidence presented.

The Chairman said an assessment was not required. The Committee would make any assessment. Facts were required, not personal opinions.

The witness said he would strike out any personal opinions in what he had to say. He said he had not met any Arabs who wanted to "dance the national dance of Israel to its national hymn". But he had met thousands who wanted to co-operate in development and to join forces to exploit the present situation until there was some political solution.

He said production had increased by three times since 1967, and income and profits by four times.

Mr. Weigert quoted the Mayor of Nablus as stating in the Jerusalem Post of 1 January 1969 that King Hussein could never expect the West Bank to again be a ranch for himself or his men.

(more)

He said the Mayor of Hebron, on 27 April 1970, had said that the terrorists were giving the Israeli authorities reason to close the area and were deliberately trying to harm the population. The Mayor, the witness said, had stated that his people had been working for peace since 1967 and would not be diverted from that aim.

The witness quoted from the Arabic press in Israel and what he termed "the new areas" to show, he said, that there was full freedom of expression.

He also quoted Angie Brooks as saying she had found no complaints in the area and had seen only friendly relations and a smile on every face.

Questions and Answers

During the questioning, the witness began to weep, and the Chairman asked him if he would like time to compose himself.

The witness said he did not. He apologized for showing his emotions.

The Chairman asked if the witness was aware of the demolition of houses. The witness said he was.

The Chairman asked if the witness felt that the punishment was proportionate to the crime. The witness said the Chairman was now asking for an opinion when, before, he had said he only wanted facts.

The Chairman said he was only asking if a reasonable man would regard the punishment as proportionate. The witness said he did not know.

The Chairman said that much evidence had been presented to the Committee. It wanted to hear the other side of the story and therefore valued the presence of the witness. The Committee attached the highest importance to his appearance before the Committee, and he thanked the witness for coming.

The witness was asked if he had heard of Felice Langer, and he said he had not. He said he worked in the field and did not have time to see, hear or investigate everything.

In reply to questions on the judicial system, the witness said he did not know why the Jordan Supreme Court had been transferred from Jerusalem. He only knew that the judicial system operated and worked. He said Jordanian law applied in the West Bank. He was certain that the criminal law was the same as before.

(more)

Asked if he was aware that everything went before a military court, the witness said he was not aware of anything like that at all.

Asked if he knew any cases of pressure on Palestine lawyers to co-operate with the military authorities, or of expulsion for a refusal to co-operate, Mr. Weigert said his evidence was exactly the contrary. It was Jordan that threatened the lawyers if they co-operated. He knew of no case of expulsion for failure to co-operate.

As far as administrative detention was concerned, he said this had applied to Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs "in the pre-1967 border". He said the same regulations now applied in Gaza and the West Bank.

He said that in both Israel and the occupied territories, the case of every detainee came up every six months for review by a committee headed by a high court judge. Unless that committee approved of continued detention, he said the detaineed had to be released.

The witness was asked if he regarded the "unification" of Jerusalem as something affecting the human rights of the people of the occupied territories. He said he did, and the effect was beneficial in improving living standards.

To questions regarding "new settlements", the witness said that in Hebron, he knew of only one new group of housing units which were within the compound of the military government. There were some military settlements at special strategic points but except for the Golan Heights, as far as he knew, there was not kibbutzing in the occupied territories.

Asked whose land was being used for new settlements in the Golan Heights, he said he did not know. Asked if the land had once belonged to Arabs who had gone out of the area, Mr. Weigert said he would not be surprised.

The Chairman said the witness had said he had criticized the Israel Government when criticism was necessary. The witness said he had done this in his articles.

The Chairman asked for examples. The witness said that in his articles, he had quoted criticisms by Arabs.

After looking up clippings, the Chairman said there was not a single line of comment by the witness.

(more)

Statement by Louis Velleman

LOUIS VELLEMAN said he was a Dutch journalist, and he had twice visited the occupied territories. He had covered the 1967 war and stayed there until about 23 June. He had gone again in September 1969 for about two weeks.

He had been in the Golan Heights, Gaza Strip and the West Bank, he stated. He had gone back last September because of rumours of a new war and had spent the time visiting the occupied areas.

Mr. Velleman said he had started in September 1969 in the Gaza Strip. then went to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. He went next to the West Bank and then the Golan Heights.

He said he had heard the same story everywhere. The Arab population always began by saying that the occupation was illegal and the Israelis should go home.

Regarding the behaviour of the occupying authorities, he said the Arabs said the military forces behaved properly. The Mayor of Gaza, he said, recognized that bombs were thrown by what the Mayor called "underground forces", and he said this was the fault of the Israelis for occupying the area.

Concerning the blowing up of houses, he said there was no doubt that this was done regularly. The Tel Aviv Press Office gave out statistics on this. Decisions, however, were stated to be taken at the highest level on this, and not by local commanders. The decisions were taken practically by General Dayan himself, he added.

Mr. Velleman said the official figure was in the hundreds.

He said it was very easy to find Arabs who would say that they were tortured. However, he had no evidence of any individual cases of torture, let alone a systematic policy of torture.

Some Israeli commanders admitted that some people might occasionally be kicked in the back or slapped in the face to get information. However, he did not regard this as torture.

Police forces all around the world did this, he went on. He had no illusions about police force behaviour anywhere, and he did not think the Israeli police were any better or worse than others, he said.

(more)

Mr. Velleman said that in Jerusalem, he was convinced that almost 100 per cent of the people in the Old City of Jerusalem would vote for an "open city". He said trade was booming. The economic situation had changed so much in the Old City that he believed that people, if only because of the tourist trade, would not want to go back to the previous situation.

Everyone he had talked to in the Old City said the Israelis were not too bad, in view of the economic situation, he stated. In the other occupied territories, he said the inhabitants said they wanted the Israelis to leave.

The witness said he had refused any Israeli help with regard to transport or an armed guard in order to be as free as possible in talking to people.

He said that, on the whole, the Arabs he had spoken to did not think the Israelis were behaving too badly.

He had lived through the German Occupation, he continued, and there was no comparison between that and the Israli occupation which, on such a comparison, might even be termed "amateurish".

Mr. Velleman said anybody who was too difficult was politely asked to go to Jordan.

On the Allenby Bridge, he said there was heavy traffic. Any Arab who would like to go from the West Bank to the East Bank could do so, in his opinion.

The witness said the Israelis always made sure that the houses were evacuated before the houses were demolished. He said they had told him they paid damages to those whose houses were demolished when it was shown that they were not responsible for the terrorism. He said he had seen the files on this in Israel.

In reply to a question, he said he could not tell if the compensation was adequate. He said there was not the slightest evidence of people being killed while in houses that were demolished.

There was not even a rumour of such practices, he added.

The Chairman said some witnesses had told the Committee that people were buried in the rubble of demolished houses.

The witness said there was a difference between a neutral journalist going to the area and a committee such as the present Committee to which witnesses were sent to testify.

(more)

The Chairman said the trouble was that there were also two kinds of neutral journalists appearing before the Committee. Some said one thing about conditions in the occupied territories, and others said other things.

The witness said he knew of no occupied area that allowed journalists to travel so freely. If there were cases of people being blown up in their houses, the international press would know. He said that journalists were always present at least on the day after the demolitions.

The witness said, in reply to a question, that he had not interviewed Arabs outside the occupied territories in Arab countries who had left the occupied territories.

Apart from Mr. Hodgkin, Foreign Editor of the London Times, he said all journalists he knew had come to the same conclusions as his.

The Chairman asked whether the underground movement in the Netherlands under the Germans could be called "terrorist".

He said the Dutch underground never threw bombs into market places or killed their own people. This is what Fateh did, he asserted. The Dutch underground had never been "terrorist", he said. Fateh might become a real underground movement eventually, he added, because they had a case.

The Chairman said that at one point, the witness had spoken of "tit-for-tat". Was there any difference regarding Israeli-occupied territories and German occupation as a policy in this regard.

The witness said there was no comparison. There was no comparison between nazi Germany and what was happening in the Middle East. He was more worried, he said, about what was happening "in Greece, communist China and Russia" than in the Middle East.

He said the Israeli prisons were all open to journalists.

In reply to questions, he said he had not tried to find out what was happening in any prison. He said he had not heard of the Sarafand detention camp.

In reply to further questions, he said that in the two weeks following the June 1967 war, when he was there, "the Israelis behaved like angels".

He said he was not aware of a Red Cross report stating that in August 1967, the Arabs were suffering great hardship in Gaza.

* *** *

10

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA — NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/520
12 June 1970

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES HEARS WITNESS

The General Assembly's Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories* this morning heard a further witness, the first heard in New York.

The witness was Joseph Abileah, a member of the Committee of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights. Mr. Abileah said he was an Israeli citizen.

The Special Committee is holding a session in New York for preliminary consideration of its draft report, which it expects to submit to the Secretary-General in August. It is also hearing any further witnesses who might wish to testify before it.

The New York session began on 10 June and is expected to conclude on 15 June. The hearing of this witness is expected to be the only one of this session.

The Special Committee earlier this year held a series of meetings in April and May in London, Beirut, Damascus, Amman, Cairo and Geneva, hearing 145 witnesses.

The Special Committee is composed of H.S. Amerasinghe (Ceylon), Chairman; and Abby A. Farah (Somalia) and Borut Bohte (Yugoslavia).

The Special Committee is expected to continue consideration of its report in Geneva in July.

The Committee will continue its questioning at 4 p.m. today.

Hearing of Witness

At the outset of today's meeting, the CHAIRMAN recalled that the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights had contacted the Special Committee after it

(more)

---

* Members of the Committee are Ceylon, Somalia and Yugoslavia.

had inserted in Israeli newspapers a paid notice asking witnesses with evidence relevant to the Special Committee's mandate to contact it.

Mr. Abileah, the witness, was then asked if he would make the following solemn declaration: "I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I will speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

Mr. ABILEAH said the fact that he came before the Committee of his free will made it self-evident that he would tell the truth and he asked that the declaration be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Special Committee had received a memorandum from the League but had had some difficulty contacting it. He said he understood the League had been created some years ago, but had been dormant for some time and had only recently been reactivated. He asked for some background on this matter.

Mr. ABILEAH said he was a musician and 55 years old.

He said some members of the League had been members of certain parties and other members had not been pleased with this and had left. He had remained because he felt that a counterweight to certain party members was required. Because he was not involved in any party politics, he had been selected to come before the Committee, he said.

In the past, he said, the Israeli authorities had not taken too seriously certain allegations regarding violations of human rights as presented by the League, because they claimed they were put forward as a pretext by certain people with a particular party background.

He said the League was now active again and complaints of violations of human rights should be taken seriously by the authorities.

The CHAIRMAN then read into the record the memorandum of the League. It quotes from Israeli newspapers regarding the reported blowing up of houses and administrative detentions and expropriations. Among the reports are those of a 26-day curfew of 22 hours a day in 1969 in the Beit Sakhur district; the alleged blowing up of 90 houses in 1969 in the West Bank; the razing of Beit Nuba Yalu and Amwas villages; the alleged blowing up of 35 houses on 11 February 1970 in Awja; and administrative detention, in Jericho in October 1969, of 13 people, who were still in jail without being charged.

(more)

Regarding prisons and torture, the memorandum mentions cases said to have taken place in 1970 involving the holding of a 90-year-old hostage and torture in Sarafand jail. There were also reports of torture in Ramallah prison.

The memorandum also states that there are reports of starvation in Gaza in 1969 in Israeli and British publications.

Mr. ABILEAH said he came before the Special Committee in the cause of the protection of human rights. Loyalty to human rights, he said, was more important than loyalty to a government.

He said he would never use the term "terrorist" in his evidence. He was entirely opposed to violence and was a conscientious objector to military service in his country and did not approve the methods used by the Arabs. Still, he said, people fighting to free a conquered territory could not be called "terrorists".

He said most of the evidence he had came from press reports. However, he believed the reports of the independent newspaper Ha-Aretz could be taken seriously.

The witness said his League had not been given permission to visit prisons. He had applied to do so, but had not received permission. However, he had gone to court proceedings and had had long discussions with defence counsel and a friend who was a military judge. He went to "the conquered areas" on an average of once a week.

He said he had not personally investigated all the cases mentioned in the memorandum.

The witness said the Administration's attitude was that they did not want to kill, but they had to deter violence and so they blew up houses. He did not agree with the justification, but that was what the Administration said.

He said it was often only on the signature of a statement by a defendant that people were sentenced. Eyewitnesses were not brought to court and 80 per cent of those coming into court charged with violence said that statements were signed under pressure and torture. There had to be something wrong, in his view, given all these examples.

Asked if he had seen signs of torture on the body of a person, the witness said he had not. However, the trials usually took place very late after arrest.

(more)

Mr. Abileah said the Government of Israel was a coalition, with many extreme nationalists.

The CHAIRMAN interrupted to say that the Special Committee did not want reasons but facts.

Mr. ABILEAH said that a very reliable source, an Arab employed as a social welfare officer by the Israeli Welfare Department and who did not want to lose his job, had told him he had been instructed to bury the body of a man maltreated in Ramallah prison. He said he was convinced that this case was true. He would give the Special Committee the name of the deceased.

He also mentioned a case he had heard of concerning an old man who had had his spine injured when beaten by a rifle butt.

The CHAIRMAN said the evidence appeared to be hearsay. Names had not been given.

The WITNESS said he had not brought names because he thought the Special Committee had sufficient names now. He would give the names. He knew of a case of two people being killed in Ramallah, he said.

Regarding the school curriculum in Gaza and other places, he said there was much hate propaganda against the Israelis before 1967. The Israeli authorities had wanted these references eliminated but Arab teachers had complained that these had been replaced by references calling for loyalty to the Israeli State.

He said he personally knew of the case of the destruction of Habla in 1967, after the cease-fire. It was, he said, a strategically situated village. The Israelis had carefully evacuated the villagers, but had left the people for a month without accommodation. They had received accommodation, he said, only after the intervention of a United States diplomat, who had threatened to make propaganda about the case in the United Nations.

He said that in the destruction of the village an old woman had died under the rubble. He said he would give the Special Committee her name.

In reply to a question, he said he worked for a federal State, Arab and Israeli, with its capital in Jerusalem.

He said that in general Israel had kept Jordanian law intact in the occupied territories, except regarding security. In this respect, he said,

(more)

administrative detentions were a violation of human rights. He said people were held for six months or more without being charged, unless they agreed to leave the area.

At the end of May, he went on, the official number of people held under administrative detention, in Israel or the occupied territories, Israeli or Arab, was 1,298. Very few of these were Israeli. He said the prisons in the occupied territories were now full and so those detained had to be moved to prisons in Israel.

In reply to a question, he said the defence laws involved applied to both Israel and the occupied territories.

Mr. Abileah said a sentence of up to two years could be applied by a single judge in military courts. For bigger sentences, three judges were required, one of whom was a lawyer, the other a military man. He had seen the law applied correctly, but in his view that was not the point. The law itself had to be fought.

In reply to a question, he said legal defence was provided in the military courts. He did not know if the counsel was the choice of the defendant.

The witness said people were destitute in some of the occupied territories. If they went elsewhere to seek work, the law prevented them from returning. People were more and more forced out of occupied areas by such economic pressures. He said the Israeli public was aware of this and people of social conscience were fighting exploitation of Arab workers.

He said that Arabs who had spoken to him about his ideas of a political solution had been told that if they continued to speak to him they would be arrested under administrative detention procedures and imprisoned for 15 years. This, he said, was intimidation. He was personally aware of this.

He said that the United States Consul in Israel had told him, when he applied for a visa to come to New York and had mentioned the Special Committee, that if the Israeli occupation was compared with the American occupation of Germany, the Israelis were a very liberal people. In his view this was not the point, the witness said.

He handed in a second memorandum, giving extracts from Israeli newspapers regarding conditions and a compilation of the number of Arab houses demolished.

(more)

10

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Press Release HR/521
12 June 1970

ISRAELI PRACTICES COMMITTEE CONCLUDES HEARING OF WITNESS

The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, at its meeting this afternoon, concluded the hearing of a witness, Joseph Abileah, an Israeli, who represented the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights.

The Special Committee will meet again at 3 p.m. on Monday, 15 June.

At this afternoon's meeting, the Committee also took note of a report on the financial implications for the meetings it plans to hold in July and August of this year. The costs would amount to approximately $10,000.

Hearing of Witness

The Chairman, H.S. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon), said that Mr. Abileah had submitted another memorandum. He asked the witness whether he wanted to speak on that memorandum.

Mr. ABILEAH said he would not.

ABBY A. FARAH (Somalia) asked whether there had been any public opposition to the Israeli laws in the occupied territories relating to abandoned property.

Mr. ABILEAH said there was the same opposition that there had been to the laws before 1967; this opposition concerned the confiscation of land. However, in the occupied areas there had been no confiscation of land in the same manner as in Israel proper.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked whether the laws in the occupied territories had caused resentment.

The WITNESS replied that in Israel the Jews could take action on a parliamentary level; he himself had taken such action on behalf of Arabs, not because they were Arabs but a matter of principle.

(more)

In the occupied territories, which were not represented in Parliament, such parliamentary action was not possible. Israel was a democracy, he stated, and there was freedom of expression; in the occupied territories there was no platform for opposition, however.

He said public opposition in the occupied territory was expressed by violence, by throwing bombs. There was no opportunity to express it in a parliamentary way.

The CHAIRMAN said it appeared that right of protest could not be exercised in the occupied territory. Were public meetings prohibited? he asked.

Mr. ABILEAH said that, in practice, the military Government could prohibit such expressions.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there was the right of appeal against the military Government decisions.

Mr. ABILEAH said this did not exist.

The CHAIRMAN asked what alternative there was.

Mr. ABILEAH said that he believed in non-violence and that he tried to explain to the Arabs that they must fight for their rights in a non-violent way.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether some means of non-violent protest was prohibited, such as public meetings.

Mr. ABILEAH said he advised the people to take the example of Gandhi in India. He opposed violent opposition such as throwing bombs.

The CHAIRMAN repeated his question -- was there peaceful dissent?

Mr. ABILEAH said there were protest marches which sometimes ended in shooting. He said there was such a march in Gaza and one by a women's organization.

He could not say whether these had been peaceful, because he had not been there. He could only base himself on press reports, which were "always biased", he said.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked whether the witness had ever seen an incident which constituted a violation of human rights.

Mr. ABILEAH said he had not seen any ill-treatment of people but he had seen Arabs assault each other. He had, however, seen infringements of rights, such as the closing of Arab schools, and he had heard of the imprisonment of people.

(more)

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked about economic pressure.

Mr. ABILEAH said there was generally no such pressure. But, in a particular village he had worked in, the people had told him they could not go to find work in the neighbouring Jewish settlements. This had been two years ago and now the problem did not exist.

Was this typical? Mr. FARAH asked.

Mr. ABILEAH said the Government would not help villages which were considered strategic.

Mr. FARAH recalled that the witness had said that in Habla, people had to go to the hills. What did that mean in human terms?

Mr. ABILEAH said the families had no food or water but later they were allowed to return. However, this was a strategic village and the authorities did not want Arabs there; later, when the United States Ambassador intervened, they were allowed to return.

Answering other questions, he said he first came to the areas a few weeks after the war in 1967. He added that he had seen an area which had been razed.

Asked whether he agreed that this had been a strategic area, he said he understood that this was so.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked what impact the destruction had on the community.

It generated hate, Mr. ABILEAH said. A home was something very valuable to Arabs, he added.

He said that Arabs freely spoke about such actions. He attempted to help them to fight for their rights in a non-violent way, he said, and many people in the Jewish sector were sympathetic to the plight of the Arabs.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked whether there had been charges of physical pressure, such as arrests.

Mr. ABILEAH said there was the constant danger of imprisonment under administrative procedures.

He stated that Arabs said that in nazi Germany people were just killed, but they add that "here it goes slowly". People never knew when they would be expelled or when they would get permits to travel, he added.

He said he had helped people get permits.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked how the hate had been expressed.

Mr. ABILEAH said there was a vicious circle: terror, repression, and terror again. But hate could turn into love, he felt; people were very sensitive to reasoning.

(more)

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked about the treatment of arrested people. Was he aware of camp Sarafan?

Mr. ABILEAH said that he had tried to visit the camp but was told he could not succeed. He hoped, however, to succeed.

Arabs in that prison had not complained to him directly, he said, but he had heard complaints from lawyers.

Was there anything reprehensible about the camp? he was asked.

Certainly there was nothing good about it, he said.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the witness had information from people who had been there. Had the lawyers he had mentioned been in Sarafan?

Mr. ABILEAH said that the lawyers could go there; he himself had not been there.

Mr. FARAH asked whether persons arrested were able to obtain sufficient legal aid.

Mr. ABILEAH said he knew only of those who had received legal aid.

BORUT BOHTE (Yugoslavia) asked whether there was collective punishment, apart from what the witness had mentioned.

Mr. ABILEAH said there was the curfew, which was imposed in retaliation to violence. It was frequently changed and the public was not sufficiently informed; accidents occurred as a result.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether "accident" was a deliberately used word?

Mr. ABILEAH said he had used the word advisedly.

What were the hours of the curfew imposed? Mr. BOHTE asked.

Mr. ABILEAH said the conditions were sometimes "very difficult". The poorer classes had only out-houses and had to cross the streets; incidents of shooting had happened.

Also, he added, people could not go to work in some cases, but mostly curfews were at night.

Were there still curfews?

He had not heard of any in the last few weeks, he said. The military Governor had told him that he wanted to interfere in the life of the people as little as possible and to continue their lives as normally as possible. The Governor had said that the Israelis did not know how long they would remain in the area.

(more)

Mr. BOHTE (Yugoslavia) asked whether the witness had made any complaints of violations.

Mr. ABILEAH said he had done so in the cases of some people, but his League had sent 18 to 20 letters to the Director of Prisons, to the Military Governor, to the Government and to other authorities.

Some had been answered but mostly "in a formal way". Nothing was done, he said.

He said that another method of collective punishment was the refusal of working permits for the Jewish areas.

Was this a penalty, the CHAIRMAN asked.

Yes, said Mr. ABILEAH, this was so in some cases. The situation was haphazard, he added.

Mr. BOHTE (Yugoslavia) asked about the expulsion of Palestinian leaders.

There were such cases when people antagonistic to the Government were expelled, the witness said.

Was this legitimate opposition to the occupation? the CHAIRMAN asked.

Mr. ABILEAH said the Israelis felt that the propaganda against the occupation should be conducted outside the country; this was why these leaders were sent to such places as Amman.

He knew of one case of a leader who was sent to a place near where he (the witness) had a summer house.

These expulsions were not too frequent, he said.

Mr. BOHTE asked what kind of leaders were mostly being expelled.

Mr. ABILEAH said these were people who had public standing before 1967; many had been members of the Jordanian Parliament. However, there was trade with the East Bank, he added.

Mr. BOHTE asked what segments of the intelligentsia were subjected to expulsion.

Mr. ABILEAH said there were no rules for this. There were cases where teachers were dismissed, he said.

Had the League protested this? He said that it had.

The CHAIRMAN asked what standing the League had in the eyes of the occupied territory. Was it asked to intercede by the people?

Mr. ABILEAH said that the people would turn to whoever would help them. There were cases when the League's leaders could help, he said.

(more)

Mr. BOHTE (Yugoslavia) asked whether the witness had seen new Israeli settlements in the occupied area.

Mr. ABILEAH said there were such settlements in the Golan Heights and on the West Bank, and there was one settlement near Hebron which was "a sentimental" settlement. Jews had lived there but there had been a massacre there in 1948.

There were only a few of a permanent character, he added. This was a result of the influence of the nationalistic and chanvinistic members of the Knesset.

Mr. BOHTE (Yugoslavia) asked about the case of the death in Ramallah prison that the witness had mentioned this morning.

Mr. ABILEAH said this had been the case of an old man "who could not stand maltreatment". There had been marks of maltreatment on the body, he stated.

The CHAIRMAN asked what steps the witness or his organization took to verify the allegations of violations.

Mr. ABILEAH said that the League published everything it had heard from witnesses and, if there was no denial from the authorities, the allegations were considered true.

The CHAIRMAN asked what actions or organizations were considered illegal.

The WITNESS said there were many, like Al Fateh. People were often the victims of informers.

Replying to questions regarding Israeli newspapers which had published reports on violations, he said that some were communist, two were "sensational", right-wing papers, and one was "new left, radical, in favour of violence".

On another matter, the CHAIRMAN asked the witness to supply, in confidence, the name of a witness concerning the destruction of houses.

It was Aref el Aref, "a serious and bright scholar", Mr. ABILEAH said.

Was this a biased person? the CHAIRMAN asked.

This could be so, but the person would say nothing untrue, Mr. ABILEAH said.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the administrative detainees could be kept indefinitely.

Yes, said Mr. ABILEAH; these people were released soon, sometimes later. He had achieved better treatment for some, he said.

(more)

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the League had ever been described as an instrument of propaganda.

Not of Arab but of communist, left-wing propaganda, Mr. ABILEAH said. The Israeli Mission had described its members as "schizophrenic", he added.

His people, he said, were highly morally motivated, but were being accused of political motives, he added.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the League had verified the case of a pregnant woman who had been beaten or did it base itself on news reports.

He could not say whether this particular case had been investigated, Mr. ABILEAH said. He added that the League accepted it.

The CHAIRMAN said that if the Committee would have to rely only on news reports, there was no use in hearing the witness.

The WITNESS said he must disappoint the Committee in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN said he observed that disappointment.

He went on to refer to another case of alleged torture.

The WITNESS said that what he had said applied to this case as well as others.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee had been accused of being a tool of Arab propaganda and that the same fate would "now befall the League".

The WITNESS said that this would be unfortunate because "the things are true".

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked whether charges had been brought against people responsible for maltreatment.

Mr. ABILEAH said that this was so in some cases although it was often difficult to identify these people because they used flash-lights during the interrogations.

Mr. FARAH (Somalia) asked for further clarification on the number of detainees mentioned in the League's memorandum and such other details as dates a and names of persons.

Mr. ABILEAH said he would supply that additional information.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the witness and his organization.

He added that he regretted that the witness could not answer satisfactorily the questions regarding verification. Also, he asked the witness to arrange that the League itself supply information on the procedure it adopted in the compilation of information which was contained in its memorandum.

He also asked the witness whether he had any contact with the Red Cross.

Mr. ABILEAH said he had not.

* * * *