

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1920th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 12 October 1972,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

*Chairman:* Mr. Carlos GIAMBRUNO  
(Uruguay).

**AGENDA ITEM 50**

**Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination**  
(*continued*) (A/8660-S/10528, A/8703, chap. XIV, sect. B; A/8718, A/8767, A/8768 and Add.1, A/8779, A/8789, A/8805 and Add.1, A/C.3/629, A/C.3/L.1937, A/C.3/L.1939, E/CN.4/1093 and Add.1-6):

- (a) Reports of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolutions 2784 (XXVI) and 2785 (XXVI);
- (b) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;
- (c) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
- (d) Draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*

**GENERAL DEBATE** (*continued*)

1. Mr. LOPEZ (Colombia) said that his delegation had no difficulty in stating its views on the item under consideration. Colombia, whose population had attained an exemplary degree of racial integration, considered it highly reprehensible that forms of discrimination which were detrimental to the dignity and fundamental rights of the individual should be deliberately institutionalized and practised anywhere in the world. It seemed anachronistic that the United Nations should still be obliged to deal with matters which should have become completely a thing of the past, since experts in anthropology and genetics had concluded that racist theories were completely devoid of any scientific basis. Racial discrimination nevertheless continued to exist and the Committee had heard moving criticisms of that situation voiced by the representatives of various countries. The time had perhaps come to propose, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 3, of the Charter, that racial discrimination and *apartheid* should be considered as "situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security", in order that the Security Council might take the steps necessitated by the seriousness of the situation, since various countries were openly flouting its resolutions. In that way the international community would avoid permitting, by default, disregard for the principles laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose anniversary was the subject of a programme recently adopted by the Committee.

2. At the 1915th meeting, the representative of Ghana had expressed the view that in addition to institutionalized racism there was another equally serious form of racism, namely structural racism. Groups of people in various countries, including democratic countries, were victims of that type of discrimination, which was created not by the will of Governments but by economic factors. For example, groups of Indians and descendants of the African slaves who had landed with the Spaniards lived virtually on the fringes of civilization in the high Andes, the Amazon Basin and the coasts of Latin America, although the Latin American States had done all they could to ensure that all their inhabitants participated in their progress and their Constitutions established the principle that all human beings were born free and with equal rights; discrimination thus existed despite the will of Governments.

3. His delegation considered that the United Nations should take appropriate steps to ensure that all mankind enjoyed the rights and freedoms set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. There were marginal groups in Latin America and other continents who would never overcome the backwardness from which they had suffered for centuries unless the great economic Powers changed their policy regarding the developing countries. To sell goods to those countries at high prices in order to make profits, to buy raw materials from them at imposed prices or to subject them to unfair terms of trade was to create an imbalance which prevented the countries of the third world from implementing a plan that would satisfy the economic and social needs of millions of human beings.

4. In that connexion, he recalled the comments made by the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations, Mr. Espinosa, who in a letter dated 19 June 1972 addressed to the Secretary-General had referred to "collective economic security", a new concept which Mr. Espinosa felt should be incorporated into the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Mr. Espinosa had expressed the view that international co-operation excluded aggression and discrimination in the field of foreign trade as well as of financial aid and technical assistance. From that principle stemmed the right of all countries to development and, consequently, to demand a fairer and more rational structure for international economic relations. Furthermore, all countries had the right to dispose freely of their natural resources for the benefit of their peoples. Their right to participate on an equal footing with other States in consultations and decisions on commercial and monetary matters must likewise be respected. Any unilateral decision in those fields was contrary to inter-

national law and to the principle of sovereign equality of States as enshrined in the Charter. Mr. Espinosa had gone on to state that those principles should be concretely spelled out in the Charter in order to prevent States from continuing to disregard them in practice. He had also referred to the view expressed by the delegation of Brazil to the effect that the Economic and Social Council should be expanded and reorganized and become, for economic matters, the counterpart of the Security Council, and that it should be empowered to hold emergency sessions for the purpose of studying and deciding on specific economic, financial and monetary situations. He had stated that Colombia supported that interesting proposal while warning that, in its view, the practice of the veto should not be introduced into the Economic and Social Council. Colombia also endorsed the Brazilian view that UNCTAD must continue to serve as the forum for the negotiations that had been entrusted to it.

5. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia had stated at the 2052nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly that international justice should not be merely theoretical but basically practical, designed to achieve equal treatment for the developing countries.

6. In Colombia's view, democracy was an essential condition if people were to participate in the taking of political, economic and social decisions and the peoples of the world were to live in peace and freedom. Moreover, Colombia feared that that system was nearing a crisis as a result of the absurd position of the great Powers which, instead of strengthening democracy, were daily taking counterproductive attitudes which aggravated existing differences and created intolerable *de facto* discrimination.

7. Mr. JAYAWICKREMA (Sri Lanka) said that the most effective manner of tackling the problem of racial discrimination was at the national level. In his country, where Sinhalese, Tamils, Moslems, Indians and the descendants of the Portuguese, Dutch and British all lived together, the Constitution guaranteed equality before the law, the right to life, liberty and security of person, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to enjoy and promote one's own culture, freedom of speech and expression, freedom of assembly and association, freedom of movement and the right not to be discriminated against in respect of employment. However, when action at the national level was impossible or ineffective, it became imperative that the United Nations should exercise its influence and authority. The statements made by some representatives in the Third Committee and in the General Assembly indicated a growing sense of impatience with the United Nations and, consequently, a lack of faith in the Organization's effectiveness. He wished to remind those representatives, however, that the Covenant of the League of Nations did not even mention racial discrimination or the question of human rights. During the 27 years which had elapsed since the establishment of the United Nations, the Organization's efforts and achievements in the field of human rights in general and the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination in particular had spanned the whole gamut of human experience.

8. With regard to the reports of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolutions 2784 (XXVI) and 2785 (XXVI), he wished in particular to commend and emphasize two projects mentioned in documents A/8805 and Add.1. The first related to the efforts of the Office of Public Information. It was essential to pursue a vigorous world-wide campaign of education and information to enlighten world public opinion and involve it in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, so as to achieve universal acceptance of the concept of liberty, equality and security of person. The second project involved the proposed establishment of a voluntary international fund to help the peoples struggling against racial discrimination and *apartheid*, which in his delegation's view would be a tangible and constructive measure.

9. It was regrettable that many developed countries which could afford to strike hard and effectively on behalf of the human rights of oppressed people found it so difficult to participate in the struggle for human dignity. In that connexion, he recalled that barely two years previously his Government had terminated diplomatic relations with the State of Israel because of the latter's failure to comply with the decisions of the Security Council. His country had taken that step as an expression of its dedication to the principles of the United Nations, despite its own critical situation. Those who were in a more fortunate position but hesitated to intervene should remember that they too were part of mankind.

10. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel) said that when the General Assembly had adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the memories of the Second World War had still been vivid. The Declaration, much of which was written with the blood of 6 million Jews, was mankind's victorious answer to the savage creed of nazism. Consequently, Israel had always supported measures aimed at eliminating racial discrimination and would continue to do so in the future.

11. The Jewish people, who had been the target of racial discrimination and physical destruction on racial grounds in the past, were still subjected to oppression in certain parts of the world. One of the gravest situations was that existing in the Syrian Arab Republic. The plight of the Jewish community in that country had caused world-wide concern, and Governments, international organizations and public figures had raised their voices against the persecution of the Jews there. The information media had called for their liberation and meetings had been convened all over the world to try to relieve their suffering. In November 1971 the International Committee for Jews in Arab Lands, headed by Alain Poher, President of the French Senate, had stated, after studying data from reliable sources, that there had been a sharp deterioration in the situation of Jews in the Syrian Arab Republic, who were being subjected to a veritable campaign of persecution by the authorities. Accordingly the International Conference for the Deliverance of Jews in the Middle East, likewise headed by Mr. Poher, had expressed its concern at the situation and wished to alert public opinion and the international authorities so as to ensure that

elementary human rights were respected in the Syrian Arab Republic. Similar statements had been published by national committees for Jews in Arab lands and various other committees on human rights, organizations of jurists, associations of resistance fighters and so forth.

12. The Jews of the Syrian Arab Republic lived in constant fear, were the victims of frequent acts of violence, and were subject to the following discriminatory and repressive measures: they must carry identity cards stamped with the word "Jew" in red letters; they were forbidden to will their property to their descendants; they were obliged to remain within three miles of their residence, and movement beyond that limit required a special permit which was rarely granted; in various Syrian cities there were curfews for Jews; they could not be employed in government service or in public corporations. In addition, Syrian civil servants and military personnel were forbidden to patronize Jewish shops. Except for doctors and pharmacists, Jewish professionals found it very difficult to practise their professions. The overseas mail of Jews was censored and was a cause of frequent interrogations. The few remaining synagogues were under constant surveillance. The Jewish cemetery of Damascus had been largely destroyed to make room for a highway; many Jewish schools had been closed, those that were still open were administered by Arab principals, and some of the Jewish teachers had been replaced by Arabs. Recent reports from the Syrian Arab Republic indicated a continuing aggravation of those conditions.

13. Referring to the plight of the Jews in the Syrian Arab Republic and in other Arab States, the former Secretary-General in 1969 had stated in the introduction<sup>1</sup> to his annual report on the work of the Organization that, although he had no direct means of knowing the conditions of life of the small Jewish minorities in certain Arab States, it was clear that, given the prevailing circumstances, it would be better for them and for the States in which they lived if their departure could be arranged, since their presence was a source of both internal and international tension.

14. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that he was greatly surprised that the representative of Israel should be discussing problems which had no connexion with the item under consideration. Religion did not constitute race, and it would be more appropriate to refer to those problems when the item 59, Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, was taken up. The representative of Israel had a perfect right to say what he wished and to accuse any State, but he should adhere to the Committee's programme. If 10 or 12 representatives became involved in a discussion on the treatment of Palestinians in Israel, the result would be chaos.

15. It was also possible that the Israel representative's statement would give rise to the exercise of interminable rights of reply and that in the process the item

on elimination of racial discrimination would be lost sight of. He therefore requested the Chairman to state his opinion.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that he thought it was his duty to accommodate any delegation that wished to exercise its right to speak. Moreover, everyone was aware that in view of the nature of the items dealt with by the Committee it was somewhat difficult to define their limits. He therefore thought it would be best to show tolerance. If the Israeli representative's statement should give rise to requests by other delegations for permission to exercise the right of reply, they would be heard.

17. After reading out article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which specified to what the term "racial discrimination" applied, he said that he based himself on that definition, which, in his view, left considerable latitude. He therefore invited the representative of Israel to continue his statement but asked him to bear in mind the remarks of the representative of Saudi Arabia.

18. Mr. TEKOA (Israel) said that the Soviet Union was composed of more than 100 nationalities, ethnic groups and races which, under the Soviet Constitution, were equal before the law. However, one group among them was not: the 3 million Soviet Jews whose homeland was not in the USSR. The Soviet Jews did not have a national life or culture of their own. They had no schools, newspapers, books or radio programmes, and, what was worse, their religious institutions had been deprived of the privileges which others enjoyed. The Jews had reacted as any race or people suffering from discrimination would react.

19. He then referred to a letter addressed to the Supreme Soviet by Yaakov Kazakov, a young Jew from Moscow, affirming that the writer did not wish to be a citizen of the Soviet Union, which denied the Jews the right to self-determination and which, applying a policy of genocide, was trying to exterminate the Jews as a nation; he did not wish to be a citizen of a country which armed and supported the Arab chauvinists who wanted to wipe Israel from the face of the earth. Kazakov had concluded by saying that he wished to live as a Jew, that he considered the State of Israel his fatherland, and that, like any other Jew, he had the right to live in that State.

20. Mr. KRUMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was obliged to speak on a point of order because the problem which the representative of Israel was discussing had no relation to the item under consideration or to any question falling within the competence of the United Nations. It was essential that all speakers should adhere strictly to the programme agreed upon by the Committee. For his part, he would be much more interested to learn what was being done in Israel to eliminate racial discrimination.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) reminded the Chairman that he himself had taken part in the drafting

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 74.

of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and said that at no time had it been intended that the text should cover religious intolerance. That was why the Committee's agenda included an item on that particular question.

22. Mr. TEKOA (Israel) also cited a letter addressed to Mr. Brezhnev by Boris Kochubiyevsky, a Jew from Kiev, stating that he wished to live in the Jewish State, where his children could study in Hebrew, read Jewish newspapers and go to Jewish theatres. Kochubiyevsky also stated that he had made similar requests on other occasions and that all he had achieved was the dismissal of himself and his wife from their jobs. He concluded by stating that he did not wish to be involved in the national affairs of a State in which he considered himself an alien. Those were the feelings not of isolated individuals, but of hundreds of thousands of Jews living in the Soviet Union.

23. Mrs. BARABANOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said she shared the position of those who had commented that the Committee was discussing the item on racial discrimination and not the item on religious intolerance. It was clear that Israel was trying to distract the Committee from its important task, making calumnious statements that were of no interest to anyone but its friends. The Jews living in the USSR were imbued with a spirit of patriotism toward their country, in which they had been educated and had received a culture. She therefore appealed to the Chairman to request the representative of Israel not to interfere in the internal affairs of other States.

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Israel to continue his statement and requested him to take into account the remarks of those speakers who had raised points of order.

25. Mr. TEKOA (Israel) said that in an appeal addressed to the Secretary-General in November 1969 the heads of Jewish families in the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic had recalled the sad history of the sufferings of the Jewish people, who, having been expelled from the land of their forefathers, had had to defend with tears and blood the right to have their own State. In October 1971 the Jews of Minsk, capital of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, had addressed a collective letter to the Soviet leaders, with a copy to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, asking only to be allowed to emigrate to Israel.

26. Recently a small number of Soviet Jews had been permitted to join their families and their people in Israel. Some persons had interpreted that as a sign of broader tolerance and understanding on the part of the Soviet Government. Subsequently, however, it had been learned that while permitting the emigration of some Jews the Soviet authorities had imposed limitations on the freedom of movement of scores of thousands. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel had already brought that matter to the attention of the General Assembly in his statement at the 2045th plenary meeting. Many Jews had been arrested simply

for wishing to go to Israel and had been sentenced to terms of imprisonment. Many of the Jews who registered at the emigration offices were dismissed from their employment and thus lost their livelihood. An open campaign of anti-Semitism was being conducted through all the information media and the publication of books. Finally, on 3 August 1972 the Government of the USSR had decided to impose a special tax on Jews with higher education wishing to emigrate to Israel. A scale had been established for the different levels of education, with taxes as high as \$25,000 or more per person. Although purporting to be of general application, the decision was in fact directed against Jews. In that connexion he drew the Committee's attention to the letter dated 21 September 1972 (A/C.3/629), from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, addressed to the Secretary-General, containing an appeal addressed to the Secretary-General and the heads of delegations to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly by more than 500 Soviet Jews from Moscow and other cities in the USSR. In that communication it was stated that the decision involved an unprecedented demand to pay a sum which was 10 times larger than everything the repatriates possessed. With rare exceptions, no Soviet expert or scientist could save such an amount even over a period of several decades. The petitioners asked that a protest should be raised against the attempts of the Soviet Union to deprive the Jews of their legitimate right to repatriation in Israel.

27. Mr. KRUMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Israel was diverting the Committee's attention from the item under consideration and, in addition, was violating Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. By referring to a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, he was intervening in the domestic affairs of another country.

28. Mr. TEKOA (Israel), continuing his statement, said that the Soviet argument concerning the brain-drain was unprecedented and irrelevant, because the Soviet Union was not a needy developing country and Israel was not offering Jewish members of the professions from the USSR higher financial rewards. In any case, people applying for emigration were generally dismissed from their employment and consequently the Soviet authorities did not make use of their knowledge. The argument that graduates had an obligation to repay the cost of their education was also unfounded. In that connexion, he referred to an article by the distinguished Soviet demographer, Uralis, published on 26 July 1970 in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, in which it was stated that in the conditions prevailing in the Soviet Union, the average university graduate repaid the State's investment in his training by four years' work. Most scientists and people with an academic education had thus already repaid the State's investment many times over through their inventiveness, research and professional work. Not only did the decree in question subject thousands of Jews to persecution and oppression, but it was also a serious infringement of intellectual and scientific freedom, which created a new kind of slavery—the slavery of scientists and intellectuals.



29. Scientists and scientific institutions all over the world had reacted with astonishment and indignation to the new limits placed on freedom. Thus, on 21 September 1972, René Cassin, President of the International Institute for Human Rights and one of the most revered figures in the international struggle for human rights, had issued a statement condemning the Soviet law establishing exit fees. He had compared the Soviet decree to the policies of Hitler and had declared that it constituted a threat to the stability of all mankind. In addition, 14 United States Nobel Laureates had endorsed a statement published in *The New York Times* on 1 October 1972, in which they had expressed dismay concerning the exorbitant taxes imposed on Soviet citizens with a higher education who were seeking to exercise the fundamental human right to leave their country. In the same statement, the Nobel prize winners had observed that an element of anti-Semitic discrimination entered into the decree, since it was obviously directed against Jews. Moreover, they had stated that the Soviet decree reduced the possibility of expanding and intensifying academic, cultural and scientific exchanges and contact between the United States and the Soviet Union.

30. It was precisely because it was in everyone's interest to achieve greater harmony between East and West and between all nations of the world in all fields, including that of science, that it was necessary to protest against the wanton and superfluous obstacles to international coexistence resulting from discriminatory measures against one particular racial and ethnic community. It was difficult to understand why the Soviet Union had adopted such a policy. Was it possible that the Soviet Government was seeking to increase its monetary resources by methods reminiscent of the extortionist levies imposed by feudal lords on their serfs? Was it possible that the right to free education guaranteed to all residents of the Soviet Union, including foreigners, was becoming a commodity with a price-tag on it? Was it possible that, in a society which aspired to socialist ideals, the exercise of fundamental human rights was to be subject to repayment in money? If there was a debt to be repaid, was it not the one owed by the Soviet State to its Jewish citizens for all they had contributed to Soviet society? Did the Soviet leaders not see that the world could only regard such measures as a form of malicious and purposeless persecution which would in no way benefit the Soviet Union itself? In the light of what he had just said, the appeal was addressed to the Soviet Government, for the sake of international understanding and coexistence and in the name of human rights, to erase the ignominy of anti-Semitic restrictions and to let Jews emigrate and join their families and people.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that as some confusion had arisen on a procedural matter, he had asked the Legal Counsel to come to the Committee and give an objective opinion as to whether the intervention by the representative of Israel was relevant to the item on elimination of all forms of racial discrimination under consideration by the Committee or whether it would be more suitable under the item entitled "Elimination of all forms of

religious intolerance", which the Committee would take up later. He reiterated his conviction that a race could not be defined by its religion. That point should be made clear to avoid setting a precedent which could lead to troublesome disputes in future. He emphasized that his objections to the statement by the representative of Israel had nothing to do with its substance but were based on procedural considerations.

32. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) pointed out that both Jews and Arabs belonged to the Semitic race. As far as religion was concerned, there were Arabs who held to the Jewish faith. She felt that that point was worthy of note.

33. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that the problem raised was a very difficult one since it pertained more to a political than to a legal issue. In 1947, someone had asked Mr. Sharet, the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs at that time, what constituted a Jew. Mr. Sharet had replied that anyone who said he was Jewish was a Jew. The question was clearly political, rather than legal, in nature, and should be left for psychologists, historians or anthropologists to solve. The question might be asked whether it was the religious or the ethnic aspect of their Jewishness which had caused Hitler to put 6 million Jews to death.

34. The Committee's agenda included two separate items, one on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and the other on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. It was for each member of the Committee to decide which of the two items was relevant to the statement he wished to make, but there could, of course, be differences of opinion on the subject. Where there was a difference of opinion as to whether a statement fell within the scope of the item under consideration, as had happened at the current meeting, the only thing to do was to make a point of order requesting the Chairman to rule on the matter. That procedure had not been followed in the present instance since the representative of Saudi Arabia, as he had explained, had not wished to put the Chairman in a difficult position. If the representative of Saudi Arabia had requested a decision, the Chairman could have resorted to the procedure—not provided for in the rules of procedure but customarily followed in the United Nations—of asking the Committee to decide.

35. Article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination specified that "the term 'racial discrimination' shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life". The question was whether religion was included in that definition.

36. He was sorry he could not be more explicit for the moment. If he was to give a more conclusive opinion, he would need time to study the statement by the representative of Israel.

37. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thanked the Legal Counsel for his explanation and said that he understood that the circumstances precluded a more conclusive opinion. The Legal Counsel had expressed his intention to study the statement made by the representative of Israel and he urged him to note, in so doing, that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination did not refer explicitly to religion. The drafters of the Convention had deliberately excluded religion from their definition of racial discrimination. The expression "ethnic origin" as used in the Convention referred specifically to cultural, racial and geographical origin and had no bearing whatsoever on religion. As practitioners of a religion, Jews did not constitute an ethnic group as such. There were Jews of all nationalities who spoke the language of those countries of which they were citizens. Many of them did not even speak Hebrew, and the colour of their skin differed considerably depending on their country of origin.

38. Mr. KRUMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that it was not the first time that Zionists had slandered the Soviet Union in order to divert attention from the crimes they were committing in the occupied Arab territories. Israel even made so bold as to criticize the Soviet Union, which was in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism, aggression and other forms of slavery. It was sufficient to recall that many United Nations organs had condemned Israel and had urged it to stop the atrocities it was committing in the Arab territories. It was well known that Israel had openly disregarded those appeals, flouting the United Nations and world public opinion. The Zionists were applying a policy of annexation which had the support of the imperialists and capitalists of the United States who were seeking to recover the ground lost in the Middle East by providing economic, military and every other kind of aid to Israel. That was what was standing in the way of an enduring peace in the Middle East.

39. International Zionism had been practising a racist doctrine since 1895, when Herzl had called upon Jews to return to their biblical homeland and had stated that the Zionist State would be in the forefront of the struggle against barbarity. During the preceding 50 years the world had witnessed a transformation of the Zionist claims: first they had asked for a Jewish homeland; today they were talking about a Greater Israel. Nobody could deny that prominent Jewish financiers had participated in manufacturing arms for Nazi Germany. The Zionists affirmed that they were concerned with the well-being of Jews throughout the world, but their acts demonstrated that their primary concern was to promote the interests of international Jewish capital which had established a dictatorship of reactionary and racist forces in Israel. It was a sad fact that the conduct of the Israeli leaders was reminiscent of that of the Nazis, who had proclaimed their concern for Germans living abroad and had used that pretext to annex other countries. It should also be remembered that in the State of Israel there was discrimination against the Jews themselves who were clas-

sified according to their origin; in that regard he referred to a letter reproduced in an issue of the periodical *Nouvel Observateur* in 1971, in which a group of Sephardim had stated that they were considered second-class citizens in Israel.

40. The Zionist organizations had now launched a hysterical campaign to "save" the Soviet Jews. It was true that Zionism, or Jewish nationalism, had become a weapon of imperialism. Furthermore, it was currently resorting to terrorism. The great anti-Soviet campaign waged by the Zionists had been conceived solely in order to justify and cover up Israeli aggression against the Arabs. Its sole purpose was to divert world public opinion away from the crimes being committed in the occupied territories; and, as if that were not enough, they were trying to attract Soviet Jews to Israel in order to colonize those territories.

41. It was a fact that Jews in the Soviet Union were not subjected to any kind of racial discrimination. As Soviet citizens they had thrown in their lot with that of the homeland which had nurtured them. Israel was trying to uproot them from their real home; but its efforts would be in vain because there had not been, was not nor would be any Jewish problem in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was a multinational State which had given the world a lesson in fraternity. Racial discrimination was an offence in the USSR, and the principle of complete equality was laid down in the Constitution and practised in accordance with Leninist principles. Jews had the same rights and obligations as all other Soviet citizens. An open letter signed by 36 British Jews with regard to the situation of Jews in the USSR indicated that Soviet citizens of Jewish origin had won the respect of all as artists, engineers and workers, for example. Jewish culture lived on and Jewish works were translated and printed on a large scale. Despite the depredations caused by various wars and conflicts, USSR society had evolved and, since there was no racial discrimination, had become a model society. The letter also stated that the hysterical campaigns mounted abroad with regard to Soviet Jews were an insult to them. The purpose of those campaigns was to restore old barriers, separate Jews from other citizens of the USSR and besmirch the name of the country.

42. As far as the situation of Soviet Jews in Israel was concerned, it would be appropriate to refer to some passages from the many letters in which they had stated that they were leading a life of humiliation and that the inhuman behaviour meted out to them made their existence unbearable. Furthermore, they requested to be allowed to return to their homeland because they considered Israel a foreign land, and they urged Jews desiring to emigrate from the USSR not to make the journey to such an inferno.

43. Although the United Nations should be a centre for co-ordinating activities relating to peace and international security and for developing friendly relations and international co-operation, the Zionists were seeking to make the United Nations adopt a hostile attitude towards certain States. His delegation considered that

the matter raised by the representative of Israel was irrelevant to the item under discussion and to the United Nations in general. Furthermore, the Israeli representative had tried to show that the USSR was violating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in particular the right of everyone to leave his own country. It should be borne in mind that the USSR was a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 12 of which stated that the right of everyone to leave any country might be subject to any restrictions which were necessary to protect national security, public order, public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others. Those facts clearly revealed the dishonesty of Israel's slanderous campaign against the USSR. His delegation rejected the scurrilous statements by the representative of Israel who was seeking to divert the Committee's attention from the item under consideration. An end should be made to that kind of attack.

44. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in the absence of the Syrian representative to the Third Committee, who had not yet been able to take up his post, the Zionist spokesman had seen fit to launch a diatribe against the Syrian Arab Republic. However, that attack, coming from those who expelled other people from their lands in order to make way for their own colonialist expansion, merely strengthened his own convictions. His delegation would like to know by what credentials the Zionist representative claimed authority to speak on behalf of the Jews of the Syrian Arab Republic. Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith did not want him to speak for them and had protested vehemently against such conduct. In that connexion, he referred to a cable addressed to the President of the French Senate, Mr. Alain Poher by the President and

members of the Religious Council of the Jewish Community in the Syrian Arab Republic. The cable stated that all Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith denounced the attempts of Zionist organs to interfere in their affairs and rejected the tutelage Israel was trying to impose upon them. It went on to say that, as Syrian Arab citizens, they owed no allegiance save to their country and Government. It also expressed their deep concern at the injustice and racial discrimination practised by the Israeli authorities against oriental and coloured Jews. Finally, they requested the intervention of the President of the French Senate in saving the thousands of Arabs held in Israeli prisons and in ending the persistent and flagrant violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Geneva Conventions of which they were the victims.

45. The statement by the USSR representative had been extremely clear and his delegation wished to thank him. He would not enter into an analysis of what the Israeli authorities were trying to conceal nor what heinous crimes they were plotting, in launching their campaign against the Syrian Arab Republic, but he would like to have an opportunity of exercising his right of reply in due course in order to reply fully to the statement by the Israeli representative.

46. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the motion would be immediately put to the vote.

*The motion to adjourn the meeting was adopted by 39 votes to 8, with 23 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*