

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 565th MEETING



Monday, 13 November 1967,
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Request by a petitioner for a hearing (concluded)</i>	77
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;</i>	
<i>(b) Report of the Secretary-General.</i>	78

Chairman: Mr. Humberto LOPEZ VILLAMIL
(Honduras).

Request by a petitioner for a hearing (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a letter from Mr. James Forman,^{1/} asking for a hearing, as representative of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, during the discussion on the item entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa".
2. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) expressed the hope that delegations which for procedural reasons had expressed reservations about hearing the petitioner would now agree that his request should be granted. Mr. Forman was intending to refer to certain economic aspects of investment activities in South Africa by Western countries, particularly the United States. He was a United States citizen who had always championed the cause of the Blacks and fought for the total elimination of racial segregation throughout the world.
3. Mr. APALOO (Ghana) thought that, if a hearing were granted to the petitioner concerned, there might be many other requests for hearings, and that would hamper the Committee's work.
4. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that he would like to study Mr. Forman's letter in greater detail. The petitioner had requested a hearing on economic questions which did not concern the Committee. He shared the Ghanaian representative's view that, if the Committee agreed to hear the petitioner, it might be inundated with similar requests and an unfortunate precedent would be established.

5. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) stated that he had no objection to hearing a petitioner who was entitled to speak in a Main Committee. On the other hand, as Mr. Forman had referred in his letter to the item on the activities of foreign interests which was in the Fourth Committee's agenda, he should be heard by that Committee.

6. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) was surprised that objections to the petitioner's request were being raised by those who had suffered most from racial segregation in Africa. The granting of a hearing to Mr. Forman would not establish a precedent, since many petitioners had been heard by other United Nations committees. For instance, Mr. George Hauser, a United States citizen, had come to plead the cause of those who had been dispossessed of their land and legitimate rights in Africa. Mr. Forman was intending to denounce the investment activities of certain Western countries, without which the South African Government would never have been able to resist the will of 13 million non-Whites. The liberation of Africa was due partly to the fact that petitioners had been heard. Established custom demanded that a committee should accede to a petitioner's request for a hearing.

7. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation was always willing to hear petitioners. On the other hand, he agreed with the representative of Ceylon that, since the item to which Mr. Forman referred was on the Fourth Committee's agenda, he should be heard by that Committee. Mr. Forman's request might therefore be transmitted to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

8. Mr. EL MASRY (United Arab Republic) supported the Guinean representative's remarks. Mr. Forman might be able to provide valuable information on the investments of Western countries. The hearing would not establish any precedent, since Mr. Forman had already been heard by the International Seminar on Apartheid, Racial Discrimination and Colonialism in Southern Africa, held at Kitwe, Zambia, in July and August 1967.

9. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the item on which the petitioner was apparently requesting a hearing was not an item before the Special Political Committee, but rather on the agenda of the Fourth Committee. He would appreciate some clarification.

10. Mr. APALOO (Ghana) remarked that, contrary to the impression which the Guinean representative might have given, Ghana had always been in the forefront of the struggle against racial segregation. If the petitioner really had some new information to provide on the activities of foreign interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting

^{1/} The text of the letter appears in the document subsequently circulated under the symbol A/C.4/699.

of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, he should be invited to speak. But he should not merely denounce those activities or make a purely emotional statement. Members should also remember that they had been provided with detailed reports on the items before them.

11. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) said he was sure that Mr. Forman would make a valuable contribution to the discussion on apartheid. But he agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the petitioner should preferably be heard by the Fourth Committee.

12. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) thought that it was very important for Mr. Forman to be heard by the Special Political Committee, since he had made an important contribution to the International Seminar at Kitwe and had provided information on the role played by the United States in the policies of apartheid.

13. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that the only way of putting an end to the colonial policies of Portugal, the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia was to attack the root cause of the evil, namely, South Africa. That was why he was convinced that there were genuine grounds for Mr. Forman's request. Mr. Forman was indeed intending to refer to the question of foreign investment in southern Africa, but first and foremost in South Africa itself. On the other hand, he was prepared to yield to the argument put forward by the representatives of Iraq, Ceylon and Sierra Leone that the petitioner should be heard by the Fourth Committee. Although he still believed that Mr. Forman had not been wrong in addressing his request to the Special Political Committee, he hoped that the Chairman would ask the Chairman of the Fourth Committee to arrange for the petitioner to be heard by that Committee.

14. Mr. KUTAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the opinion expressed by the United States and other representatives, to the effect that the petitioner should not be heard by the Special Political Committee because the item on economic assistance to South Africa was on the Fourth Committee's agenda, was inconsistent with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2202 A (XXI), paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 (b). The petitioner should, in fact, be heard both by the Special Political Committee and by the Fourth Committee. However, if the Guinean representative agreed that the petitioner should be heard only by the Fourth Committee, the delegation of the USSR would not oppose a decision to that effect.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, he was not authorized to accept the Guinean representative's proposal unless it was formally before the Committee. He could not transmit the petitioner's request to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee unless the Special Political Committee so decided.

16. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) formally supported the Guinean representative's proposal.

17. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) also supported the proposal, and thought that the Chairman of the Special Political Committee could decide to transmit the petitioner's request for a hearing to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

18. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that the Guinean representative seemed to have rather a poor knowledge of the history of the world-wide struggle against racial segregation, in which he himself had participated since the 1920s. With regard to the petitioner's request for a hearing, he asked whether it was the responsibility of the Chairman of the Special Political Committee to transmit the request to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee or whether the Special Political Committee was required first to accept or reject the request.

19. The CHAIRMAN replied that he was not empowered to transmit the petitioner's request for a hearing to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee unless the Special Political Committee officially requested him to do so.

20. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) observed that there was no longer any difference of opinion on the request for a hearing, and proposed that that Committee should now decide whether the request should be transmitted to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

21. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) supported that proposal. Replying to the Liberian representative, he said that he had no wish to enter into polemics on the question of racial discrimination, one of the few points, if not the only one, on which all members of the Committee were in agreement.

22. The CHAIRMAN, after summarizing the views expressed, suggested that the Committee should transmit the letter containing Mr. Forman's request for a hearing to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 35

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (*continued*) (A/6688, A/6818 and Corr.1):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/6864 and Add.1);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/6825, A/6873 and Corr.1)

23. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) expressed deep regret that the hateful policy of apartheid had not diminished in intensity since Major Ernesto Che Guevara, speaking at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly (1299th plenary meeting), had condemned it. In absolute disregard of the thirty or so resolutions of the General Assembly and the five resolutions of the Security Council, the fascist Pretoria régime has intensified racial discrimination by new acts, regulations and administrative measures, stepped up repression and executed a number of members of the Pan-Africanist Congress.

24. Every year the General Assembly heard evidence of the horrors committed in South Africa and of the violations of its resolutions and decisions by that same groups of countries which by their attitude enabled the racist South African régime to survive. Racism was a manifestation of the exploitation of the black majority by the white minority in South Africa; that

exploitation was also to the advantage of the Western Powers which traded with South Africa and found in that country an opportunity for large-scale capital investment. The whole world was confronted daily with evidence that those Powers, particularly the United States of America, placed their economic interests above humanitarian and moral considerations. Likewise, it could not forget that the South African Government had sent troops to participate in the aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and was supporting the United States Government in its criminal aggression against the Viet-Nameese people. It was logical that those who were assassinating the Viet-Nameese because they sought their freedom, should associate themselves with those who were assassinating the black population for the same reason.

25. The participants in the International Seminar at Kitwe had asked why the United States had been able to break off its trade with Cuba and the People's Republic of China but had been unable to do it in the case of South Africa. That contradiction proved the hypocrisy of the United States Government's policy. The reasons for which the United States sought to impose a trade embargo against Cuba were crystal clear: the Cuban Revolutionary Government was anti-imperialist, it was combating colonialism and neo-colonialism and it supported the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America which were fighting for their freedom. The South African Government, on the other hand, applied the policy of apartheid, permitted the capitalist exploitation of the country, authorized foreign investment and fought against the peoples which were struggling against colonial exploitation; that was reason enough for the United States to increase its trade with South Africa and to support its Government.

26. The responsibility for the violence in South Africa must be borne by those who helped to maintain the practice of apartheid by their political, economic and military support. The colonial Powers which defied the United Nations bore the responsibility for the sacrifice of the South African people. The problems of that people would not be solved by United Nations resolutions. It would free itself by its own efforts, and he was gratified that the black population was preparing to meet racist imperialist violence with revolutionary violence. His delegation reaffirmed once again that the Cuban Revolutionary Government firmly intended to give the national liberation movements in South Africa its full moral and material support.

27. Mr. EREN (Turkey) did not believe he could add anything new to the arguments advanced on the subject of apartheid or the solutions proposed. He wished to say, however, that his country associated itself with the increasingly vehement protests voiced against the anachronistic practice of apartheid, for history had proved that reason always triumphed over force in the end. That did not mean that action was not urgently necessary, but pressure should continue in order to precipitate action. His delegation, while sharing the indignation and impatience shown by many countries, deemed that there was cause for hope because the universal and unanimous condemnation of apartheid had prepared the way for a solution.

28. The question of apartheid had been raised twenty years previously because apartheid was applied to a certain group of people. Since then it had been denounced and condemned categorically by the entire world. Turkey had opposed all racial and religious discrimination in its territory for almost 1,000 years, and that long history had inspired the Constitution of the Turkish Republic, which guaranteed equality before the law to all citizens, whatever their language, race, political opinion, philosophy or religion.

29. Turkey had supported all United Nations efforts to put an end to the system based on the principle of race superiority and for that reason it had refrained from establishing diplomatic, consular or trade relations with South Africa. It had strictly applied the Security Council resolution of 7 August 1963 (181 (1963)) concerning the arms embargo, and had participated in such international gatherings as the Kitwe Seminar, which had permitted co-ordination of efforts for the final assault against apartheid.

30. The action taken by the United Nations to combat that scourge was justified by two important legal considerations. First, apartheid was a flagrant violation of the rules of conduct that States Members of the Organization had undertaken to observe and defend. Secondly, it had created an explosive situation which constituted a dangerous threat to international peace and security. The evidence had never been denied, but the fact that some countries laid greater emphasis on one aspect of the question and some on the other had hampered international action. In fact, those two aspects of apartheid were equally inadmissible and were equally matters of concern to the General Assembly and the Security Council. If the resolutions which had been adopted had not had the desired effect, it was because they had not been strictly and universally applied.

31. All representatives were unanimous in denouncing the policy of apartheid and demanding its elimination, but they were not agreed on the means to be used. It would seem that a choice had to be made between the hope that the situation would improve by itself and the need to intervene to hasten that improvement. The iniquity of the system of apartheid and the threat it represented were constantly increasing and jeopardized the authority of the United Nations.

32. His delegation would therefore support a resolution based on the recommendations of the Kitwe Seminar (A/6818, para. 123) and the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/6864 and Add.1). It was time to pass from condemnations to action and put an end to apartheid by the adoption of such a resolution, which was the only means by which violence could be avoided.

33. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that his country's position on the question of apartheid, which had been stated repeatedly, reflected its earnest concern in the face of a serious political and moral problem. For the Jews, the question of apartheid was first and foremost a question of principle and conscience, a fundamental moral issue which derived from Israel's opposition to every form of racial discrimination. Frequent reference had been made during the debate to the

harrowing agonies of the Jewish people, victims of dreadful racial persecution, during the Second World War. The extermination of the Jews was to have been the corner-stone of a new satanic world order, an order which the Jews had helped to overthrow. However, the struggle of the Jews against oppression and for human values and national freedom went back to a much earlier date. It had originated at the time when the Jews had been slaves in Egypt and had continued through their long journey in the wilderness to independence in their ancestral home. It was then that they had given full expression to their true faith which was to inspire them throughout the centuries. The Jews had then proclaimed the original brotherhood of man and of a world which could be redeemed by that renewed fraternity. Since ancient times, Jewish society, united by its faith, had always been a fortress in defence of its ideal, but it had been and was still open to all those who would spontaneously observe the divine law.

34. Another pillar of Judaism had been the strong feeling of equality, not only between men but between nations, and the striving for an ultimate international order built on justice and love. The Jews had been dispersed throughout the world and everywhere had been subjected to discrimination. Nevertheless, when they had found the strength to create a modern and dynamic national movement out of an age-long faith, they had besought only recognition of their existence as a people and a place in the family of nations, and they had worked for reconciliation. They had not forgotten that other nations and races were still struggling against oppression in many parts of the world and they decided to come to their aid. Theodor Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement, had written at the end of the previous century that once the Jewish State had been created, its first task would be to ensure the liberation of Africa, as he had made clear in his novel *Alt-neuland*,^{2/} in which he had expressed the deepest sympathy for the African negroes. His teaching had not gone unheeded and the State of Israel, ever since its inception, had taken a clear stand in favour of self-determination and decolonization. Most emerging nations in Africa and Asia had established brotherly ties of amity and mutual co-operation with Israel. The revival of the Jewish people as a nation had inspired other movements of national liberation. William DuBois, the most important pan-Africanist before the Second World War, had written: "The African movement means to us what the Zionist movement must mean to the Jews."^{3/} Marcus Garvey, who had fought for the liberation of the negro with a zeal which was famous, had been deeply impressed by Zionist theory and ideas. In more recent times, George Padmore, one of the foremost theoreticians of pan-Africanism, had dedicated a chapter of his main work, *Pan-Africanism or Communism?*,^{4/} to the theme of "Black Zionism".

35. Israel's standing on the apartheid question was but a corollary of its fundamental tenets and was determined by its cultural heritage. Until those ideals were recognized by all, every State Member of the United Nations should take the necessary steps, within

the framework of the Charter and according to the procedures established by that Charter, to fulfil the solemn obligations it had assumed and to eradicate apartheid. His delegation would confirm its position of principle in its stand on the resolutions eventually presented to the Committee.

36. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya), exercising his right of reply, said that when the representative of Israel had exercised what he had described as his right of reply at the 561st meeting, he had in fact engaged in an exercise of distortion of facts and had introduced various irrelevant allegations against Libya, for the sole purpose of diverting the Committee's attention from the issue before it. That was an old technique which representatives of Israel used in all debates to prove the authenticity of their rights in Palestine and the legitimacy of their policy and practices.

37. In its statement at the same meeting, his own delegation had pointed out certain basic similarities between apartheid as practised in South Africa and the kind of policy which the Zionist authorities were following with regard to the indigenous people of Palestine, and had drawn attention to the features common to both systems. His delegation had stated facts, and facts were difficult to refute or to ignore, since they always came to the fore. That was why, despite seventy years of Zionist propaganda, the basic facts of the Arab-Israel conflict were still present in all their clarity, despite attempts to justify the return to Palestine of the alleged descendants of the Jews who had left that country more than 2,000 years previously, whereas the ancestors of the Arabs had been living there long before that time.

38. Even had he tried, the representative of Israel could not have refuted the similarities between the system of apartheid practised in South Africa and that in Israel, any more than he had been able to give specific examples of the same policy in Libya. He had therefore introduced into the debate unfounded allegations regarding the treatment of the Jewish community in Libya. The Israel representative had referred to a tragic incident at Tripoli in 1947, when both Jews and Arabs had been killed. That incident, as his own delegation had already explained fully, had been provoked by the Jewish agency to sow panic among the Jewish community in order to persuade the Jews to emigrate to Palestine with a view to the creation of the Zionist State. Such were the facts. Moreover, all the Jewish communities in the world were still subjected to Zionist pressure—as witness the appeals by the Prime Minister of Israel, published in *The New York Times*, urging United States Jews to migrate to Israel in order to help populate its enlarged Territory.

39. The report of massacres of Jews in Libya at the time of Israel's aggression in June 1967 which had been published in the Italian newspaper *La Stampa* were neither objective nor authentic. Furthermore, the alleged Tripoli correspondent of *La Stampa* had not even been in Libya during the crisis. *La Stampa* was known to be one of the leading Zionist-supported papers in Europe and the statements in the same article to the effect that several Italians had been killed and 40 per cent of Italian property in Tripoli had been destroyed were likewise without foundation.

^{2/} Haifa, Israel, Haifa Publishing Company, 1960.

^{3/} *Africa, A Handbook*, London, Anthony Blond Ltd., 1965, p. 413.

^{4/} London, Dennis Dobson, 1956.

The Italian community in Libya had categorically denied those reports as soon as they had appeared and the Italian Government was well aware of the facts. Indeed, when Israel had committed its aggression against three Arab countries in June 1967, his Government had adopted certain precautionary measures to ensure public safety and to protect the Jewish community.

40. His country could not be accused of nazism, for it had been one of the main victims of the unholy alliance between nazism and fascism, and one of the first countries to fight on the side of the allies in their just struggle. The allegations that there were Nazi sympathizers in Libya were utterly false.

41. Lastly, he wished to refer to the Israel representative's assertion that the Israel Government had voted for Libya's independence. When the draft resolution, inspired by the Bevin-Sforza agreement,^{5/} had been submitted calling for the division of Libya into three regions, each controlled by a foreign Power, Israel had been rather pleased with the prospect and had abstained in the vote, choosing to remain "neutral" between colonialism and freedom, division and unity, and foreign subjugation and national liberty. It was scarcely necessary to explain that, in such a situation, an abstention was equivalent to a negative vote. When the resolution had been rejected, thanks to the vote of the representative of Haiti, the situation had completely changed and all the supporters of the first resolution had decided to support the resolution giving independence to Libya (289 (IV)). In those circumstances, it would have been difficult, and even pointless, for Israel to vote against it.

42. His delegation maintained and reiterated its belief that there were fundamental links and undeniable similarities between the system of apartheid as practised in South Africa and apartheid in Israel. There was institutional, historical and legislative evidence that such was the case. If the representative of Israel could not admit those facts, for understandable reasons, he should abandon his attempts to divert the Committee's attention by the introduction into the debate of totally irrelevant arguments.

43. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that the Libyan representative had again injected into the debate elements which had nothing to do with the question under consideration. Nevertheless, he had indirectly confirmed the facts submitted by the Israel delegation, including those concerning Israel's vote in favour of the resolution on Libyan independence. He had also confirmed that excesses had occurred in Libya. He himself did not intend to deny that in June 1967, after several days of horrendous violence, the Libyan Government had taken steps to protect the Jewish population of that country. It was deplorable that the representative of Libya should have chosen to assert that the tragic events in 1947 had been provoked by the Jews themselves. This was nothing but the well-known technique of the Nazi propaganda. It was true, moreover, that there were Nazi sympathizers in Libya, some of them even having positions in the University.

44. Mr. AL-DAOUD (Iraq) observed that the representative of Israel always tried to minimize his country's responsibilities and was constantly referring to the persecutions which the Jews and Zionists had suffered. The representative of Israel had said that Zionism was a liberation movement. Arnold Toynbee, however, in one of his books compared the deeds committed by the Zionists against the Palestinian Arabs to those committed by the Nazis against the Jews. It was regrettable that a people that had suffered so much at the hands of the Nazis should imitate their methods and commit acts that were just as odious. A United Kingdom politician had said recently that nowhere in the world was apartheid practised in a worse form than in Israel. That country was simply a military base for colonialism and a tool of imperialism in the Middle East: in 1956 it had allied itself to the imperialist invasion forces. It was only through the influence and support of the West that Israel had been created and since then that country had violated all the principles of the Charter by refusing to comply with the resolutions concerning the compensation to be paid to the people who had been expropriated, both Christians and Arabs. It was those same forces that were now supporting South Africa. Without the help of the imperialist Powers, neither South Africa nor Israel would be able to perpetrate the crimes they were committing; South Africa would heed the United Nations resolutions on apartheid and the Zionists would comply with the resolutions concerning the refugees and the city of Jerusalem. The whole world had been shocked when the Jews had seized the City of Jerusalem, in defiance of the Charter and of the United Nations. The Iraqi delegation was convinced that apartheid in its worst form was being practised in South Africa and in Palestine, and that, only if all assistance to those two countries was halted, would it be possible to put an end to the suffering of the enslaved peoples.

45. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that the vote on Libya's independence had enabled his country to see who were its true friends: when the Bevin-Sforza draft resolution calling for the division of Libya had been rejected, the only solution left had been independence. The representative of Israel had pointed out that it had been only after the crisis that steps had been taken to protect the Jewish community in Libya. Perhaps he would have liked the Libyan Government to take those steps before the crisis, but unfortunately the Israel Government had not seen fit to announce its intentions in advance and it had taken the entire world by surprise.

46. He would only point out that the Red Cross had sent a representative to Libya at the request of the Libyan Government and that that representative had concluded from his investigation that the Libyan Government had done its best to protect the Jewish community, offering its members the choice between remaining in their homes, where they would be afforded protection, or taking refuge in Government quarters, where again they would be protected, housed and fed; the Jews of Libya had also been given the opportunity to leave the country, with a re-entry visa. He noted, moreover, that the representative of Israel used only two epithets—Communist and Nazi—to describe the Governments that did not share his

^{5/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part II, Annexes, document A/873, para. 18.

views: it was hard to understand how they could be both at the same time.

47. Mr. AZOUNI (Saudi Arabia) declared that Zionism and apartheid differed not in kind but in degree. The statements of the Zionist spokesman were designed to hoodwink the members of the Committee and to enlist support for the Zionist objectives. While shedding crocodile tears over the fate of the victims of apartheid, the Tel Aviv authorities were waging a war of attrition designed to annihilate the indigenous people of Palestine, both Arab and Christian, and to destroy their national identity. Those who were prone to crime could not be honest defenders of the victims of crime. Saudi Arabia's position on apartheid emanated from the deep religious teachings of the Koran. Islam had rejected the concept of a chosen people and a superior race more than thirteen centuries earlier. That was why the representatives of the Arab peoples had always condemned racial intolerance, apartheid and genocide as inhuman practices.

48. The white settlers in South Africa believed in coexistence of their own creation: the incarceration of 87 per cent of the total population in 13 per cent of the area of the country, on arid land without any natural resources. The Zionists, for their part, believed only in their own existence and in a policy of massacre, terror and expulsion, which many other Jews repudiated.

49. Israel and South Africa were outposts for colonial exploitation in Asia and Africa. He would merely mention the fact that the diamonds mined in South Africa were cut in Israel.

50. Condemnations of persecutions of the Jews in any country should be addressed to the Zionist authorities of Tel Aviv, who sent their agents provocateurs into countries where Jewish communities were living in harmony with their non-Jewish neighbours. He would merely refer, in that respect, to the conclusion at which Mr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Zionist Organization, had arrived in 1958: anti-semitism, which had been the primary force keeping the Jewish people together throughout the centuries, was declining and its disappearance threatened the future survival of the Jewish people.

51. The real motive for Jewish immigration into Israel was not humanitarian but military. Zionism, using threats and terror, was the accomplice of those whose policy of apartheid held human beings in bondage.

52. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that he could provide a great deal of information on the sinister contribution that Saudi Arabia had made to the history of slavery, and also on the persecutions that had taken place in Iraq, but in view of the late hour he would refrain from doing so. The eminent personalities whom he had quoted in his statement had apparently not convinced the representative of Iraq; he wondered whether that representative revered Arnold Toynbee to the point of sharing that historian's opinion of the history of the African countries.

53. He categorically denied the incredible calumnies that had once again been spoken against his country.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.