

## 2132nd meeting

Thursday, 16 October 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2132

### AGENDA ITEM 77

**Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights: report of the Secretary-General (concluded) (A/10156 and Add.1)**

### EXPLANATIONS OF VOTE

1. Mr. NOTHOMB (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158, said that his delegation had with regret been obliged to abstain. It fully understood the aspirations of peoples struggling against colonialism but rejected the use of force, which was contrary to the principles of the Charter, and could not therefore accept operative paragraph 1: if it had been put to a separate vote, his delegation would have voted against it. His delegation had voted against operative paragraph 4 because of the mention of the North Atlantic Treaty—a defensive treaty which had nothing to do with the situation in southern Africa. Furthermore, his delegation had serious reservations about operative paragraph 5 and had therefore been forced to abstain when it had been put to a separate vote.
2. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 because the sponsors had introduced in operative paragraph 5 a matter which was irrelevant to the subject of the text and which was being considered separately by the General Assembly.
3. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158. None the less, his delegation had reservations concerning some paragraphs: if operative paragraph 1 had been put to a separate vote, his delegation would have abstained because it could not encourage recourse to violence. It had been obliged to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 4 since the wording was too extreme. Australia, which had broken all relations with Southern Rhodesia, did not consider that its contacts with South Africa encouraged that country to persist in its repressive policies; Australia was trying on the contrary to persuade South Africa to make its policy conform with the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions. His delegation had also abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 5, because the reference to the Palestine question raised a matter which was being examined separately by the General Assembly.
4. Mr. GROS (France) reiterated, with regard to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158, the reservations expressed earlier by his delegation concerning the legitimacy of armed struggle. France, like others, could not endorse operative paragraph 4 concerning NATO.
5. His delegation, moreover, had reservations about the unexpected amendment concerning the Comoros: France was not, of course, in any way opposed to the exercise of the right to self-determination of the Comoros, as the current process of consultation proved. Furthermore, past history showed that, where the right to self-determination was concerned, his country had discharged the responsibilities incumbent on it.
6. Mrs. HEANEY (Ireland) said that her delegation felt that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 contained many constructive elements. She wished to associate herself in particular with the views expressed concerning the new States Members of the United Nations and the situation in Angola. None the less she had been forced to abstain in the vote on operative paragraphs 4 and 5 and, in view of her reservations on operative paragraph 1, on the draft resolution as a whole.
7. With regard to operative paragraph 1, her delegation thought that the struggle for independence and self-determination must take account of the Charter of the United Nations and be conducted as laid down in Article 1 "by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law". Ireland, which observed strictly the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and had often made clear in other fora its abhorrence of the system of *apartheid*, regretted that the force of operative paragraph 4 had been weakened because it singled out particularly the policy of certain members of an organization whose activities were not relevant to the item before the Committee. Finally, operative paragraph 5 did not take into account all the aspects of the Middle East problem: in that respect her Government had made its position clear on the appropriate item on the General Assembly agenda in plenary meetings at previous sessions, and had supported Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).
8. Mr. von KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 in spite of its strong support for the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. It would have voted against operative paragraph 1 if a separate vote had been taken: as a matter of principle and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Federal Republic of Germany, which had renounced the use of force with regard to the settlement of its national problem, could not support it for the solution of international problems. His delegation had voted against operative paragraph 4 because it rejected categorically the accusations against NATO, a defensive alliance limited to the geographical region of the North Atlantic. The Federal Republic of Germany had no military relations or co-operation with South Africa, condemned *apartheid* and applied the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia. Finally, his delegation had abstained in

the vote on operative paragraph 5, although it was in agreement with the basic idea expressed, because it doubted whether at that moment a condemnation served the purpose of ensuring the continuation and intensification of the negotiation process.

9. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) regretted that, on an issue as important as the right of peoples to self-determination, it had not been possible to arrive at a text which could be supported by the Committee as a whole. His delegation had a slight problem with regard to the second preambular paragraph: it could not accept, and in any case the Charter did not specify, that the realization or non-realization of the right to self-determination could in itself be regarded as synonymous with the enjoyment or non-enjoyment of human rights. The United Kingdom rejected the call to arms made in operative paragraph 1, and therefore interpreted paragraph 8 as referring solely to humanitarian assistance. He had voted against paragraph 4 and recalled in that respect that, in February 1975 the Secretary-General of NATO had told the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, while the latter was visiting Brussels, that NATO under its Charter had a well-defined geographical limit which did not include South Africa, and that it had no contact or political, military or technical understanding with South Africa which could give comfort to the latter in the implementation of its *apartheid* policy or lend it respectability. Lastly, paragraph 5 was unacceptable in its current form because it described an extremely complex matter in a simplistic way.

10. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that he had voted for operative paragraphs 4 and 5 and for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 as a whole. None the less, in accordance with Fiji's policy of preferring peaceful negotiations, he expressed reservations concerning the concept of armed struggle referred to in paragraph 1.

11. Mr. TUERK (Austria) said that his delegation supported the objectives of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 but had had to abstain in the vote because there were some elements in the text which it could not accept. It would have abstained if a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraph 1, because of the reference to "all available means". Austria had abstained in the vote on paragraph 4 because it did not think that the severance of all relations with South Africa helped to promote the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. It had also abstained in the vote on paragraph 5, because it felt that such condemnation was not the best means of achieving a peaceful settlement and a just and lasting peace for all the peoples of the Middle East.

12. Mr. KLOSSON (United States of America) regretted that the United States could not support a text on a principle that had been so important in its own national history. He would have preferred it to have taken into account not only the importance of self-determination but also the wide variety of ways in which it could be exercised, among others the right of free association. His delegation could not support recourse to armed struggle as envisaged in operative paragraph 1 and objected to the unfounded contention in paragraph 4. Finally, paragraph 5, which politicized the principle of self-determination by singling out some individual cases while ignoring others, was unacceptable.

13. Mrs. MASSON (Canada) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 because it had serious reservations: it had voted against operative paragraph 4 because it rejected the reference to NATO, a defensive alliance which had a limited geographical framework and no jurisdiction over the foreign policy of its members. It had abstained in the vote on paragraph 5 in order not to prejudge the debate to be held in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine, which in no way affected Canada's position on the Palestinian problem as such. Her delegation also had reservations about the wording of paragraph 1.

14. Ms. FINBORUD (Norway), speaking also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, said that the Nordic countries supported the aims of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 but had reservations with regard to certain paragraphs and therefore had abstained in the vote on the draft as a whole. Had operative paragraph 1 been put to the vote separately, the Nordic countries would have been unable to vote affirmatively because, no matter how desperate the situation of the colonial peoples, they could not condone recourse to violence, which was contrary to the Charter. The reference to NATO in paragraph 4 was irrelevant in that context. Finally, the Nordic countries had abstained in the vote on paragraph 5 because it simplified an extremely complicated problem and could be misinterpreted.

15. Mr. MARGIOTTA-BROGLIO (Italy) said that the Italian delegation, in all bodies of the United Nations, had always upheld the noble principle of self-determination and hoped that the countries still under colonial domination would soon become independent. It was not, however, able to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 in its entirety because it had reservations with regard to certain parts of it. First of all, the recourse to force envisaged in operative paragraph 1 contradicted the principles of the United Nations. Secondly, the Italian delegation felt obliged to denounce the specific reference to NATO in that context. NATO was a defensive organization which was in no way responsible for the fact that colonial peoples were deprived of their right to self-determination and independence.

16. Miss BEAGLE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158. However, she had certain reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 1, 4 and 5 for the reasons which had been set forth the preceding year, at the 2090th meeting, on the occasion of the adoption of a draft resolution on the same subject which had subsequently become General Assembly resolution 3246 (XXIX).

17. Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands delegation was sorry to note that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2158 was incomplete because it covered only the political dimension of a multi-dimensional concept of self-determination. Moreover, some of its operative paragraphs contained unacceptable elements. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft as a whole. It wished to place on record that it had been unable to condone recourse to "all available means including armed struggle", which it regarded as contrary to the Charter. With respect to operative paragraph 4, it rejected the conclusion that NATO, a geographically limited defensive

alliance, could have contacts with the racist régimes of southern Africa. Nor could it accept the selectivity shown in that paragraph or the argument that the maintenance of political contacts with the Governments of southern Africa would encourage those régimes to persist in their policy. On the contrary, it felt that such contacts would contribute to improving the situation in that area of the world. Finally, the Netherlands delegation felt that paragraph 5 placed the problem in the wrong context and did not take into account efforts to find a just and peaceful solution through negotiation; it had therefore abstained in the vote on that paragraph.

18. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had thus completed its consideration of agenda item 77.

### AGENDA ITEM 68

#### Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*)\*:

(a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/10003, chap. I, chap. V, sect. B.1., paras. 307-313; A/10145 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5636 and Add.1-3, E/5637 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/638, A/C.3/L.2154-2156, 2159)

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

19. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) said that when the Committee, at its 2130th meeting, had put to a vote the question of the admissibility of the new draft announced by Somalia, he had mistakenly abstained and wished to vote in favour.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that correction would be duly noted in the summary record.

21. Miss BIHI (Somalia) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, which was simple and to the point. The preambular paragraphs recalled and quoted General Assembly resolutions 1904 (XVIII) and 3151 G (XXVIII). They noted and took into account texts which had been adopted during the current year: the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace, adopted by the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held in Mexico, resolution 77 (XII), adopted at the twelfth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held in Kampala, and the Political Declaration and Strategy to strengthen International Peace and Security and to intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among Non-Aligned Countries, adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Lima. The single operative paragraph showed beyond question the link between Zionism and racial discrimination. She hoped that the draft resolution would receive the support of the entire Committee. She announced that the Ukrainian SSR had joined the sponsors and asked the Secretariat to correct the name of Yemen in the English text, where it had been wrongly called "Yemen Arab Republic".

22. Mr. VERRET (Haiti) said that document A/C.3/L.2157, which contained amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII), had become, by a decision of the Third Committee, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.2159. The Haitian delegation had voted against the principle underlying that change. It had, however, yielded to the majority opinion and agreed to continue the discussion.

23. Haiti had always fought racial discrimination and had suffered from it from the very beginning of its existence. The colonialist peoples of Europe, fearing the example which Haiti might set for the peoples they had enslaved, had for more than a quarter of a century refused to recognize the independence and sovereignty of the Haitian State. His delegation felt that racial discrimination was a pestilence afflicting the human race. Nevertheless, it could not regard a people's national feeling for unity as a form of racial discrimination and considered that Zionism was, in a way, the expression of a religious nationalism.

24. That was why his delegation would be unable to vote for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, in which Zionism was equated with *apartheid*, colonialism and racial discrimination. Zionism had nothing to do with *apartheid*, colonialism or racial discrimination. It was a Jewish way of thought which was intimately bound to Judaism and no one had previously thought of making it a crime against mankind. It could be understood as a concept aimed at promoting the unity of a people dispersed all over the world, under the banner of a religious creed, for a better life in a hostile society. Zionism was founded on the brotherly feelings of solidarity of a people tortured for centuries which, thanks to the United Nations, had been able to return to the land of its ancestors. The Haitian delegation did not feel that boundary disputes could be considered as colonialism or racial discrimination. Driven from their ancestral soil more than a thousand years previously, the Jews, in their sad and long wanderings across the world, had mixed with all peoples and all races. Zionism could in no way be equated with *apartheid*, which was the exaltation of racial purity. *Apartheid* was a political doctrine proclaiming domination of the people by a chosen race. Zionism was a doctrine of union and brotherhood for the survival of a people which had been martyred for its faith and which had always had to fight for the survival of its present and future generations. The Jews had for centuries been the victims of all kinds of discrimination. Faithful and earnest believers, pilgrims exiled from their promised land, they had died for the city of God. Now that the world had changed its strange concepts and moved towards a juster and healthier society, the Jews should have their place in the city of men. It was in that spirit that the Haitian delegation, imbued with the principles of justice and fairness, and desirous always of promoting peace through reconciliation of peoples and Governments, would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

25. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq) said that his delegation wholeheartedly supported the resolutions relating to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and also the new draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2159). It seemed useful, however, to comment on certain statements

\* Resumed from the 2130th meeting.

made in the Committee on behalf of zionism, in particular by the representative of Haiti, whose delegation had been one of those to succumb to United States pressure in 1947 and change its vote on the resolution concerning the partition of Palestine. In the first place, it must be stated that the new draft resolution was not an attack on an established religion; that clarification was necessary because some seemed to want to confuse zionism with Judaism. The Israeli representative equated zionism with Judaism and accused members of the Committee of launching an organized attack on an established religion.

26. What was zionism? Many Jewish theologians—from the most traditional to those of the reform—had argued that zionism was antagonistic to the major propositions of Judaism, and the most orthodox Jews denounced zionism as a blasphemy and as the arch-enemy of the Jewish people. The Zionist organization had been established on the basis of the programme adopted at the first Zionist Congress, held in Basle in 1897. That programme aimed at the establishment in Palestine of a secure home for the Jewish people, and, for the attainment of that aim, it provided for the promotion of colonization by Jewish agriculturists, artisans and tradesmen, the organization and gathering of all Jews, and finally the promotion of Jewish national feeling and consciousness. Despite certain ambiguities, the aim of the programme was quite clear: to promote the colonization of Palestine by Jews from all over the world. The representatives of zionism claimed at the United Nations that the programme had been approved and included in the Mandate entrusted by the League of Nations to Great Britain. Nothing illustrated more clearly the discriminatory nature of the Mandate itself. The preamble to that document incorporated a private letter addressed to Rothschild, which had become known as the Balfour Declaration, the 28 articles of which included not a single reference to Arabs. From the very outset the Zionists had accused the anti-Zionists of spreading false allegations about their movement; yet from the beginning the Zionists themselves had tried to hide the true intentions and dimensions of their colonialist venture. They had denied that they wanted a State in Palestine—they wanted only a refuge they had said—and they had maintained that zionism had never had expansionist intentions, and then they denied that it was racist and was based on discrimination. In 1969 Golda Meir had proclaimed: "I want a Jewish State with a Jewish majority; that is what zionism is all about." A parallel could be found in the statement made in 1963 in South Africa by the then Prime Minister: "We want to keep South Africa white . . . keeping it white can only mean one thing, namely, white domination . . . control, supremacy", which clearly revealed the similarity between zionism and *apartheid*. In 1972 the twenty-eighth Zionist Congress had openly claimed all of Palestine and lands beyond Palestine for the Zionist State. That movement, which some held to be a liberation movement, was based only on subjugating and dispossessing another people; it was not in fact a liberation movement, but an act of colonial aggression. Today the State of Israel was seeking only to strengthen its position in the occupied territories, where new settlers were constantly arriving. Like the minority régime in South Africa, the Zionist State could survive only when there was a constant flow of foreign immigrants, whites for South Africa and Jews for the Zionist State.

27. The question arose as to the part played by the Zionist movement in implementing Israeli aggression and expansion. Yigal Allon had stated in 1968, when he was Minister of Labour, that zionism was the secret weapon of Israel's survival. It appeared that immigration was now more than ever the overriding concern of the Zionist establishment, the aim being to have 7 or 8 million Jews in Israel within 25 years. He stressed the importance of immigration for zionism because it raised the question of the links between zionism and anti-semitism.

28. Who profited most from anti-Semitism? The Arabs had nothing to gain and much to lose from it and the Jews certainly did not profit from it. But what about the Zionist movement and the Zionist State of Israel? The representative of Israel had stated at the 2117th meeting that anti-Semitism was the *raison d'être* of the Zionist movement; if anti-Semitism disappeared, political zionism would become redundant, and immigration to Israel, and also contributions to the Zionist movement, would come to an end. The assimilation of Jews into the communities where they happened to be living was the greatest enemy of zionism. The fact was that it was precisely political zionism that the Committee was considering: the discussion had nothing to do with cultural or religious zionism. Indeed, whenever there were signs that anti-Semitism was waning, the Zionist activists sought to revive it, and they simulated it where it was non-existent. According to a report on the situation of the European Jewish communities published in *Yediot Aharonot* on 29 May 1964, the author, Dr. Gevanyahu, stated that Swedish Jewry was also corroded by assimilation and that even the idea of emigration to Israel was still remote; anti-Semitism, therefore, had a certain role to play in preserving Jews and Jewishness. In 1963, Moshe Sharett, the Chairman of the Jewish Agency, had told the 38th Congress of the Scandinavian Youth Federation that the freedom enjoyed by the majority of Jews imperilled the cause of political zionism and, at the 26th World Zionist Congress, the delegates were told that the Jew was endangered by the diminution of anti-Semitism in the United States. "We are endangered by freedom," he declared. Ben Gurion was also quoted by *The Jewish Guardian* of February 1975 as having said that not always and not everywhere did he oppose anti-Semitism.

29. And how was anti-Semitism to be used by the Zionists as an encouragement to emigration to Israel? That policy was best revealed by the editor of *Davar*, the official organ of the socialist labour party (Mapai), which was headed by Ben Gurion. The editor, Sharun, wrote that he was not ashamed to confess that the best method to encourage immigration would be to send efficient young Zionists where Jews were absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction to plague those Jews with anti-Semitic slogans such as "bloody Jew", "Jew go to Palestine", and similar insults.

30. Zionism was unique in that, in order to survive, it not only perpetrated discrimination against non-Jews, but also instigated discrimination against the Jews themselves to uproot them from their countries and settle them in Israel. It was therefore not surprising that the Zionist representative in the Committee should try his utmost to link anti-zionism to anti-Semitism. The Zionists should, however, realize that the truth was catching up with them, and that they would not be able to get away with their duplicity much longer. Anti-Semitism as a basic tool of

zionism should be condemned as strongly as zionism. If there was a roll-call vote on a draft resolution condemning anti-Semitism, the Zionist representative would find that his manoeuvre had failed; he would see that delegations could take different stands on anti-Semitism and anti-zionism, because they were two separate and different issues. The Jewish communities settled in Arab countries had been the first to suffer from the evils of zionism, which had not only urged them to uproot themselves, but had also gone so far as to have bombs planted in their synagogues and cafés as an encouragement. All those facts had already been exposed to the Committee at previous sessions. The oriental Jews who had been uprooted from Arab territories were discriminated against in Israel by Jews from Europe. Even the greatest thinkers and philosophers of Judaism were disappointed at the situation prevailing in Israel, and were concerned about the condition of Arabs there. The Jewish philosopher, Martin Buber, went so far as to equate the zionism of the State of Israel to an inviolable egoism similar to that of Mussolini and Hitler. Only those who were ignorant of the laws of the Zionist State doubted the existence of racism and discrimination in Israel. It sufficed to refer to the laws on return, nationality, the property of absentees, the requisitioning of land, and so on, all of which Jews themselves criticized in many works. The Minister of the Interior himself had admitted in the Israeli Parliament that the Israeli laws were discriminatory. In an article published in *Yediot Aharonot* on 9 August 1974, Shulamit Aloni, a minister in the current Israeli Government, spoke of the rejection by the Israelis of "Gentile humanism" and the open discrimination to which non-Jews were being subjected. An Israeli, Professor Shahak, President of the Israeli League for Human Rights, referring to the statement by the Israeli Minister of Agriculture to the effect that Arab control of agriculture was a cancer in the body politic, had said that a minister who could speak thus of persons with full citizenship was a Nazi Jew.

31. As to the similarities between zionism and *apartheid*, Mr. John Davis, former Commissioner General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), had stated that Arabs and Jews would be able to live together peacefully once again when the practice of *apartheid*, currently applied in Israel against Arabs, had ended. Israel, like South Africa, was an *apartheid* State. That had been pointed out by no less authorities on *apartheid* than Mr. Verwoerd and Mr. Vorster themselves. Mr. Verwoerd had said, in the *Rand Daily Mail* of 23 November 1961, that Israel, like South Africa, was an *apartheid* State. Mr. Vorster, in an interview with C.L. Sulzberger in the *New York Times* of 30 April 1971, stated that Israel was faced with an *apartheid* problem and that South Africans viewed Israel's position with understanding and sympathy. It was not surprising, therefore, that the South African Zionist Federation and the South African Jewish Board of Deputies worked actively to deflect criticism of South Africa by other Jewish bodies. According to a December 1962 issue of the *Jewish Chronicle*, the Board of Deputies had resolved that the Jewish community should take steps to explain South Africa's position to Jews overseas and at home. It was to be noted that none of the Zionist-oriented Jewish non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the United Nations ever raised or discussed the *apartheid* issue in the United Nations.

32. But what was the attitude of the Western countries, the traditional protectors and accomplices of zionism, the South African régime and *apartheid*? They defended zionism, but also cast doubt on the motives of those who knew by experience what zionism was and who had suffered from it, for the characteristic attitude of the Western world towards the Palestinian problem was to accept automatically the distortions of the Zionists and to maintain its long-standing verdict against the Arabs. Those who defended zionism should understand that they were favouring racism and discrimination against the non-Jewish population of the Holy Land.

33. In alleging, as he had at the 2121st meeting, that the word "racism" was used in the amendments as a term of opprobrium applied to any possible adversary, the representative of the United States seemed to forget that the non-Jews of Israel had suffered from such racism and discrimination for the past 27 years; but that undoubtedly did not matter to him. Perhaps that representative was himself a Zionist, since he accepted the Zionist claim to be a liberation movement, and he asserted that to associate zionism with racism was a distortion of history.

34. President Truman himself had acknowledged the underlying reasons for adopting such a position when he told the experts of the Foreign Office who urged him not to support the partition of Palestine that he had to answer to hundreds of thousands who were anxious for the success of zionism, whereas he did not have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among his constituents.

35. In conclusion, he referred to a statement made by Winston Churchill, who, in 1944, just after the assassination of Lord Moyne in Cairo, had said in the House of Commons that if the laborious efforts on behalf of zionism and its idealistic dreams for the future should lead to barbarous acts of gangsters worthy of nazism, many, including himself, would have to reconsider their long-standing position with regard to zionism. If there was to be hope for a peaceful and successful future for zionism, an end should be put to such shameful activities and those responsible should be punished. According to the latest information received, the gangsters had not been punished; many of them continued to hold important posts within the Zionist movement, and the assassins of Lord Moyne had recently been given national funerals like heroes. It was therefore high time that the supporters of zionism took another look—perhaps painful—at the history of their movement and remembered the words of Winston Churchill.

36. Mr. FUENTES (Bolivia) said that his delegation had examined with interest the two draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolutions 1938 A and B (LVIII) (A/10145, annex, drafts A and B) concerning the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

37. In his delegation's view, draft resolution A dealt with all fields in which action must be taken in order to achieve the objectives of the Decade. Draft resolution B constituted a further step towards the convening of the world conference referred to in the Programme for the Decade, since it provided for appropriate consultations to be undertaken on the subject of the proposal by Ghana.



38. His delegation had no objections to put forward with regard to draft resolution A. Nor did it have any with regard to draft resolution B, but it was none the less concerned at the economic implications which the holding of successive international meetings involved for the developing countries. Its affirmative vote would reflect its sincere appreciation of the Economic and Social Council, whose work had been remarkably effective and in keeping in every respect with the principles and objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

39. His delegation had examined with the same interest the amendments submitted in document A/C.3/L.2157, now replaced by document A/C.3/L.2159. It believed that a factor which was political and therefore controversial had been added to the first of the drafts recommended by the Council, which was in itself of an eminently humanitarian character. *Apartheid* was a discriminatory system, based essentially on an arbitrary evaluation of human nature. The same applied to colonialism and foreign domination, attitudes of political domination which were totally anachronistic and contrary to the evolution of history. On the other hand, it was, to say the least, questionable to link zionism with *apartheid*, colonialism and foreign domination, since the objective of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was to combat any segregation which took the form of a militant and discriminatory attitude.

40. His delegation had doubts regarding the effectiveness of the text contained in document A/C.3/L.2159, since it went beyond humanitarian considerations. It weakened the objectives of the draft resolutions prepared by the Council, which had described exhaustively all the fields and all the activities in which human dignity was affronted through the practices of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

41. Referring to the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154, he said that the situation of migrant workers was one of the most serious problems confronting the developing countries. His delegation considered it necessary to create international safeguards to defend the human capital which would enrich the population and economies of the host countries but whose absence harmed the countries of origin.

42. Those amendments constituted an appropriate appeal to the international community for co-operation with respect to a question which arose in many parts of the world. It was essential, as the Venezuelan delegation had said at the 2121st meeting, for temporary migrations to be regulated and made subject to established norms, so that the right of every person to a better job and to well-being could be exercised in a more rational manner. Each country should regulate the number of persons or families which it could receive to carry out the tasks which required additional manpower and it should communicate that figure to the countries of origin. In that way, there would be no cases of odious competition between the national worker and the foreign immigrant. Such competition was keener when the worker had entered the host country illegally and was a victim of all sorts of abuse.

43. His delegation supported the amendments in question but considered that the new sub-paragraph to be added to

operative paragraph 3 would be more complete if the wording was changed to read: "Ensuring the cessation of all discriminatory measures against migrant workers entering the host country in accordance with its legislation and extending to them and their families treatment equal to that provided for nationals of the host country". He was not making a formal proposal but merely a suggestion.

44. Mr. VINCI (Italy), setting forth the position of the nine members of the European Economic Community (EEC), recalled that their Governments had always approved of most of the proposals included in texts which sought to define the action to be undertaken during the Decade, and supported in particular those concerning the holding of an international conference. They were prepared to co-operate faithfully in promoting the success of that undertaking and they had always stipulated the limits which they could not exceed and the provisions in respect of which, for various reasons, they had to express reservations.

45. He had explained why the EEC countries were unable to support the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157. The same arguments had led the Governments of the nine countries to oppose draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, which repeated the substance of amendments already rejected by them. The wording used was not itself any more acceptable than that of the earlier amendments, since the Governments of the EEC countries categorically rejected the concept that zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination. The delegations of the nine countries would remain faithful to their commitments and would vote in favour of draft resolutions A and B contained in the annex to document A/10145; they took that opportunity to reaffirm their deep-rooted hostility to all forms of racism, including *apartheid*.

46. However, it was essential not to overlook the serious consequences that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 would have. Once a programme, with its objectives and means of action, had been approved by consensus, no attempt should be made to modify it in other ways. If that was done, it would be entirely logical and justifiable for the countries which had accepted it to reverse their position. At the political level, furthermore, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 would not fail to have deep repercussions on public opinion in many countries, not only because of its content, but also because of its wording. If that draft resolution was adopted and if the entire question was to be submitted to the plenary General Assembly for adoption in such a way as to maintain a link between zionism, racism and the Decade, the nine member countries of the European Community, much to their regret, would no longer be in a position to support the draft resolutions recommended by the Council.

47. Mr. HERZOG (Israel) recalled that, at the 2121st meeting, one of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157 had requested, in the interests of consensus, that the consideration of and the vote on draft resolution A and the amendments thereto should be postponed. That had occurred when it had become clear to the African and other delegations that the introduction of an amendment linking zionism to the subject of the draft resolution in question would lead many countries to vote

against the draft. An effort had therefore been made to produce a text which would create the impression that the condemnation of Zionism was not linked to the item under discussion. Nothing was farther from the truth. It was not necessary to be a seasoned diplomat in order to perceive the direct link which the sponsors of the draft resolution had established between Zionism and racism. As a result of that insidious attempt to link a vital element of the Jewish religion and faith with the main elements of draft resolution A, his delegation would, unfortunately, be constrained to vote against both draft resolutions recommended by the Council.

48. When one talked about Zionism, one was talking about an integral part of the Jewish religion. For 4,000 years the sanctification of Jerusalem and of Zion had been a basic tenet of the Jewish religion. There was nothing mysterious or sinister about the Zionist movement which based itself on biblical Zionism. It was launched in the late nineteenth century as the liberation movement of a small people, expressing as it did the need of that people—the Jewish people—for revived freedom in its ancient homeland. The re-establishment of Jewish independence in Israel, after centuries of struggle to overcome foreign conquest and exile, was a vindication of the fundamental concepts of the equality of nations and of self-determination. To question the Jewish people's right to national existence and freedom was not only to deny to the Jewish people the right accorded to every other people on the globe but it was also to deny the central precepts of the United Nations. Throughout history, only the Jewish people had seen the land of Israel as a distinct spiritual and political entity, as the centre of its national existence, of its religion and of its civilization. The Arab inhabitants of Israel had always considered themselves to be part of the Arab nation which had by now vindicated its rights to self-determination and independence in 20 sovereign States.

49. The attempt now being made by certain Arab Governments to strike at the very roots of Israel, by trying to denigrate Zionism, its ideological basis, was nothing but a renewed effort by the enemies of the Jewish people to deprive it of its homeland.

50. Unlike the sponsors of the anti-Zionist draft resolution, Israel had a free and democratic society which was striving to implement the highest ideals of mankind—political, social and cultural—for all the inhabitants of Israel, irrespective of religious belief, race or sex. Zionism had created a society in which Arabs were free and equal citizens and enjoyed freedom of expression, including the right of publicly opposing the policies of the Government of Israel.

51. Zionism had been the first movement in the Middle East to base itself on the dignity of labour, of the working man. Not so long ago, Palestinian Arabs from the West Bank in territory administered by Israel had declared in an interview given by Arabs to Arabs and published in an Arab newspaper in an Arab country, that the Israelis had given for the first time to the Arab worker the image of man and the dignity of a human being.

52. The draft resolution, which was designed to divert the Committee from the true purpose of the Decade, was part

of a dangerous anti-Semitic idiom which was being insinuated into every debate by those who had sworn to block the current move towards accommodation and ultimately towards peace in the Middle East.

53. The Jewish people were following with interest the present discussion and were only too aware of its horrible implications. It was a sad day for the United Nations and for humanity when the world body was drawn into a debate arising out of an attack against one of the main elements of Judaism, the religion which had given the world some of its greatest ideals and had given birth to Christianity and Islam. In that spirit, his delegation asked the other delegations to reject out of hand draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. It requested a roll-call vote on the issue of Zionism so that the position of each country could be on record.

54. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) said that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 before the Committee had the complete support of his delegation. In a spirit of fraternity among men, the draft resolution denounced retrogressive movements which were aimed only at dividing mankind.

55. In the course of the discussion some voices had objected to the contention that Zionism must be placed in the same category as other racist ideologies. As on many other occasions, the representative of Israel had tried to sow confusion among the members of the Committee by seeking to persuade them that Zionism, the ideology underlying Israel's militaristic and colonialist policy, was nothing more than the expression of the right of oppressed peoples to recover their native land.

56. The main objections had been advanced by the Western countries, particularly the countries of the European Economic Community, and by the United States; and that was not surprising. Speaking on behalf of the countries of the Community, the representative of Italy had tried to link questions which were quite unrelated, namely, the decision concerning the draft resolution regarding the implementation of the Programme for the Decade, which the members of the Committee wanted to be adopted by consensus, and the decision on a draft resolution which, for its part, the delegation of Jordan wished to be adopted by an overwhelming majority. Consequently, certain questions arose as to the seriousness of the attitude of those countries which, having declared themselves ready to support the draft resolution recommended by the Council, appeared to seize the first pretext for withdrawing their support. It was to be hoped that they would reconsider their position and, as they had promised, would support the Programme for the Decade and that the suspicions of their attachment to the *apartheid* régime, to which some of their reservations had given rise, would not be confirmed. It was regrettable that countries priding themselves on a long democratic tradition should adopt such an attitude and, as had happened at the 2130th meeting, should have recourse to procedural manoeuvres to prevent other delegations from expressing their viewpoint.

57. He wished to point out quite objectively that it was in Europe that the Jewish problem had first arisen. While racial tensions and cultural prejudices were universal phenomena, it was in Europe that the violent persecution of

the Jews had reached incredible proportions, culminating in the Nazi atrocities during the Second World War. There had been no similar situation in the East where for centuries the majority of Jews had lived peacefully, contributing to the Arab civilization which flourished in that region.

58. It was in Europe that Zionism had emerged in the late nineteenth century. Zionism in fact was a negative and hostile reaction to negative and hostile circumstances. It was based on the same negative premise on which anti-semitism was predicated, namely, that Judaism should constitute the basis of a distinct national identity, that it should be exclusive and in a necessary relationship of hostility with its environment. Zionism emerged as a call to the Jews not to seek their future in universal brotherhood but in a perverted national chauvinism which brought them as conquerors to a peaceful land which they had invaded, sowing violence and terror among an innocent population.

59. The complex feeling of Westerners about the plight of the Jews in Europe was understandable. They involved guilt, compassion and eagerness to remedy an episode of gross human injustice in Western civilization. However, it was hard to understand their insensitivity to a similar situation and their tolerance of the fact that peaceful Arab populations were being exposed in the Middle East to systematic and organized violence.

60. Jews should not be confused with Zionism any more than Italians should be confused with fascism or Americans with the Ku-Klux-Klan. Within every people it was possible to find movements and ideologies that were harmful and subversive. They must be identified and condemned in the interest of humanity. Such was the case with *apartheid*; such as also the case with Zionism. The Zionist movement had enjoyed in Western countries the support of many well-meaning citizens who had been led astray by intellectuals and pseudo-liberal politicians pursuing opportunist aims. With the help of Israel, Zionism had built up powerful bases in Europe and America, feeding on the feeling of guilt and on the ignorance of the majority regarding the situation in the Middle East. It had created powerful lobbies in Western legislatures and had erected an information barrier around the public in those countries which prevented any meaningful dialogue with the Arabs who only sought their self-protection and their rights. That had been clear in 1947, when Israel was expanding beyond the area earmarked by the United Nations General Assembly, during the Suez War in 1956 and again in June 1967. The situation was just as clear at the present time, when Israel was negotiating for massive quantities of destructive and offensive weapons, and the role played by Zionist ideology in that situation was equally clear.

61. Many Jewish leaders and thinkers had been aware of the danger of Zionist subversion since the early days of the movement. Lord Montagu, a member of the British Cabinet early in the century, had argued passionately against the British Government's adopting the Zionist formula for the future of the Jewish people; the formula was, however, adopted in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, despite his protests. During the 1930s and 1940s Juda Magnus had fought hard inside Palestine to prevent the disruption of Arab-Jewish coexistence and the occupation of Palestine at the expense of the Arab majority. Many Jewish leaders,

inside and outside Israel, were currently arguing against Zionist leaders who persisted in a policy of violence, intransigence and militarism. There were many liberal Jews in Western countries who were raising their voices against Zionist lobbies in defence of the cause of freedom and justice.

62. The Committee was not dealing with the Middle East question as such. It was dealing with the question of discrimination and measures that it could take to combat racism wherever it occurred. That required a broad and comprehensive definition of racism. It thus did not seem possible to exclude from the category of racist ideologies an ideology which professed, implicitly and explicitly, racial and religious superiority.

63. Peace could return to the Middle East, and it was to be hoped that it would return with brotherhood and tolerance, for the three were linked. There could be no brotherhood or tolerance as long as a racist and discriminatory ideology persisted in the region.

64. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of Israel that his statement contained many errors or at least erroneous ideas. The partition of Palestine in 1947 had been presented to the world as a *fait accompli*. The Palestinian people had been forced to seek refuge in neighbouring countries where some had hoped that with luck they would be assimilated into the indigenous population or would disappear without trace, exhausted and resigned or eliminated through death. That had been a miscalculation. The Palestinian people were a separate people. Just like any other Arab people—Iraqi, Egyptian, Syrian or Lebanese—they did not want to be merged with another people. That was a fact. Yet the representative of Israel was trying to convince the members of the Committee that the Jewish people formed a single people according to the precepts of Zionist philosophy which claimed that, irrespective of their geographical, cultural or historical origin, all Jews scattered throughout the world were one people, the chosen people of God. That was a feeling of exclusiveness very much akin to racism. The Zionists had embraced the Jewish religion in order to establish their temporal authority in the Middle East. They should learn the lessons of history, which for centuries had shown that the spiritual and the temporal could not be united. Long before Zionism, Christianity and Islam had both failed in undertakings of the same sort. Peter the Hermit had preached the reconquest of the Holy Land and evangelization of the infidel, and the crusades had failed. The Abbassids and the Omayyads had invoked the Prophet with a view to establishing their supremacy, and they too had failed.

65. To justify Zionist expansionism, the Israeli representative had invoked the unity of the Jewish people. Yet one had only to refer to the Jewish encyclopaedia, which could not be suspected of bias, to see that there was nothing in common between certain Jews of non-Semitic European origin, who had converted for historical reasons, and the oriental Jews who had lived peacefully with the Arab populations in the Middle East. What right had the United Kingdom to give a country which did not belong to it to others? The fact that European Jews had been the victims



of European intolerance was no reason for them to establish a régime of intolerance in the Middle East. Judaism had flourished in the Middle East, and so had Christianity and Islam. There were three religions in Palestine, and no one of those religions could logically be regarded as having pre-eminence. For centuries oriental Jews and Arabs had lived peacefully side by side in Palestine. The Arab peoples were willing to make peace with all other Jews provided that they abandoned their colonialist and expansionist policy, symbolized by zionism. If Jews from all over the world came to Palestine inspired by religious feelings, they would be well received; but if they used their religion to invade the country and to dispossess its inhabitants, all Arabs would unite to ensure no peace would be made which would be prejudicial to the Palestinians, whose sacrifice would not be in vain. The representative of Israel had invoked Judaism, which cemented the union of Jews throughout the world. It was time for the Israelis to be guided by the spirit of the Bible as the Arabs were by the spirit of the Koran, instead of keeping to the letter of the interpretation given to it by the dangerous ideology of zionism.

66. He did not see how countries which flaunted their democratic virtues could refuse to support a draft resolution which extolled the solidarity of all people. He urged them to realize the dangers of an ideology such as zionism. He also appealed to the representative of Israel to accept the facts in the hope of seeing true brotherhood re-established in Palestine in the future.

67. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had neither contested nor refuted the arguments he had put forward. On the question of the Jews who had been hanged at Baghdad, he said that Iraq was not the first, nor would it be the last, country to execute traitors and spies. Apparently Israel did not criticize South Africa, with which it was on the best of terms, for the executions that took place there which, according to statistics, accounted for more than half of the death penalties carried out in the world in a year. Moreover, Israel seemed willing to forgive South Africa not only for the hangings but also for its leaders' past; Prime Minister Vorster had been imprisoned during the Second World War for his pro-Fascist activities and had himself said how proud he was of that.

68. As for Iraq, a broadcast on the radio station of the *New York Times*, WQXR, on 19 May 1974, had stated that the Iraqi Jews of India still considered Baghdad their spiritual home. He read out an article from the magazine *Israel Digest*, which had appeared in the issue of 30 August 1974, in which an Iraqi Jew spoke of discrimination against oriental Jews in Israeli society dominated by Ashkenazim Jews, which showed that Jews who had emigrated from Iraq were on the whole highly educated and included craftsmen, traders, civil servants and administrators and members of the liberal professions.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*

## 2133rd meeting

Friday, 17 October 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2133

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Shahani (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 68

**Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (continued):**

(a) **Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)** (A/10003, chap. I, chap. V, sect. B.1., paras. 307-313; A/10145 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5636 and Add.1-3, E/5637 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/638, A/C.3/L.2154-2156, 2159)

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

1. Mr. KAMARAKE (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation had given careful consideration to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 and to the effects, adverse or otherwise, which it would have on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination if it was adopted by the Committee at the present time. Although his delegation

agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution that the situation now being considered was extremely complex, it was also aware of the need to keep the possible success or failure of the Decade in mind.

2. The word "zionism" was not unknown in his country and other West African countries, for it had been used in their early struggle for political emancipation. Thus, authors and political scientists such as George Padmore, Edward W. Blyden I, Dr. Azikwe and the late Dr. Nkrumah had used the term "black zionism", which referred to a movement to encourage the return to Africa of displaced Africans whose forebears had been uprooted from their homelands and sold into slavery in many areas of the Western world, in particular the United Kingdom, the United States and the West Indies. He did not believe that at that time the world had thought of the countries advocating black zionism as racist. Rather, it had been considered that they were simply conscious of their race. Thus, black zionism had been looked upon in a positive sense. However, his delegation was not certain whether Jewish zionism was considered in a positive sense by the