



CONTENTS

Agenda item 68:
Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:
(a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;
(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
Report of the Third Committee (part I).....

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
Report of the Third Committee.....

Agenda item 78:
Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa
Report of the Third Committee.....

Agenda item 69:
Human rights and scientific and technological developments: reports of the Secretary-General
Report of the Third Committee.....

Page

769

**President: Mr. Gaston THORN
(Luxembourg).**

AGENDA ITEM 68

- Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:**
(a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;
(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

**REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (PART I)
(A/10320)**

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

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/10309)

AGENDA ITEM 78

Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/10321)

AGENDA ITEM 69

Human rights and scientific and technological developments: reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/10330)

1. Mrs. SEKELA KANINDA (Zaire), Rapporteur of the Third Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 68, 77, 78 and 69, contained in documents A/10320, A/10309, A/10321 and A/10330 respectively. The report in document A/10320, on items 68 (a) and (c), refers to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. This report deals with a problem whose importance is evident to all. This is why the Third Committee gave it priority when it established its programme of work.

2. The various statements made in the general debate on these subitems show that all delegations unanimously stress the importance of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the necessity for concerted action in order to achieve the objectives of that Decade. They all agree to co-ordinate their efforts to eliminate this scourge from the face of the earth.

3. All delegations favourably greeted the offer of the Government of Ghana to act as host to the world conference in 1978, a conference which is to be an essential element in the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. During its consideration of the item, the Committee adopted five draft resolutions, two of which were recommended by the Economic and Social Council. In paragraph 27 of its report, the Third Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of these five draft resolutions.

4. Draft resolution I deals with the implementation of the Programme of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and in this resolution the General Assembly would condemn the intolerable conditions which continue to prevail in southern Africa and elsewhere, including the denial of the right to self-determination, and the inhumane and odious application of *apartheid* and racial discrimina-

tion. It would reaffirm its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of oppressed peoples to liberate themselves from racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, colonialism and alien domination. It would urge all States to co-operate loyally and fully in achieving the goals and objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination by taking such actions and measures as, among other things, implementing United Nations resolutions bearing on the elimination of racism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination and the liberation of peoples under colonial domination and alien subjugation. The General Assembly would decide to consider this matter at its thirty-first session as a matter of priority.

5. Draft resolution I, recommended by the Economic and Social Council, was adopted in the Committee by 126 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

6. Draft resolution II, also recommended by the Economic and Social Council, is entitled, "World conference to combat racism and racial discrimination". In operative paragraph 1, the General Assembly would note with appreciation the offer of the Government of Ghana to act as host to the world conference envisaged as a major feature of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 126 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

7. In draft resolution III, entitled "Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination", the Assembly would determine that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. This draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 70 votes to 29, with 27 abstentions. As members of the Assembly are aware, the draft resolution was the subject of many consultations, in addition to meetings and highly charged procedural and substantive debates in the Third Committee.

8. On the subject of the voting on this draft resolution, I should like to inform the General Assembly that the delegations of Argentina and Thailand abstained in the vote, but their abstentions were not recorded by the voting machine; this is indicated by the foot-note to paragraph 22 of the report of the Committee.

9. Draft resolution IV relates to the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. In operative paragraph 1, the Assembly would appeal to the Governments of all States to sign, ratify and implement without delay the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. The draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 88 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

10. Draft resolution V, relating to items 68 (a) and (c), is entitled "Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination". In this draft resolution the Assembly would express its satisfaction with the increase in the number of States which have ratified the Convention, and would appeal to States which have not yet become parties to the Convention to accede thereto. The draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 106 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

11. The report on agenda item 77 [A/10309] relates to the 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. In this connexion, the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of its report.

12. According to that draft the Assembly would once again reaffirm the importance for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, to national sovereignty and territorial integrity and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples as imperatives for the enjoyment of human rights. The draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 106 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

13. The report on agenda item 78 [A/10321] concerns the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa. In the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of the report, the General Assembly, being aware that, in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 1864 (LVI) of 17 May 1974, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities appointed a Special Rapporteur to evaluate urgently the importance and the sources of political, military, economic and other assistance given by certain States to the racist and colonial régimes of southern Africa, as well as the direct or indirect effects of such assistance on the perpetuation of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, would decide to consider this item at its thirty-first session as a matter of high priority and, in that regard, would request the Secretary-General to submit the final report of the Special Rapporteur, along with the recommendations of the Sub-Commission, to the Assembly at that session. The draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by 94 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

14. The report on agenda item 69 [A/10330] deals with human rights and scientific and technological developments. The Third Committee has recommended to the General Assembly for adoption a draft declaration on the use of scientific and technological progress in the interests of peace and for the benefit of mankind. The draft declaration was adopted in the Committee by 95 votes to none, with 20 abstentions. Furthermore, in paragraph 19 of the report, there is a draft decision which the Third Committee also recommends to the General Assembly for adoption. By this the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of the thirty-first session the item entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments" as a priority item. The draft decision was adopted in the Committee by 105 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Belgium has asked to speak on a point of order.

16. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): On a point of order, Mr. President, I formally request that, under rules 74 and 77 of the rules of procedure, the General Assembly pronounce on the deferment to its thirty-first session of the Assembly debate, and consequently the vote, on draft

resolution III, which is recommended to us at the end of the report in document A/10320 of 3 November 1975.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has just heard a request, under rules 74 and 77 of the rules of procedure, for the deferment of the debate on draft resolution III to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. Rule 74 provides that: "In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote." In accordance with that rule, I shall call on two speakers for the motion and two speakers against.

18. Mr. WILSON (Liberia): I should like to second the motion just proposed by the representative of Belgium. There are many delegations here which are not too clear about what is zionism and what is racism, and there are others which have not even received instructions from their Governments. The deferment of consideration of this draft resolution would enable them to study the question thoroughly and to reach an unbiased decision.

19. I ask, Sir, for a roll-call vote on the motion.

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Many more than four representatives have asked to speak. I shall call upon them in order and ask them to say whether they are in favour of or against the motion.

21. Mr. ADJIBADÉ (Dahomey) (*interpretation from French*): The question of concern to us and which is dealt with in draft resolution III is one with which we are all familiar. Each of our delegations has had the opportunity of participating in the work that led to the adoption of the draft resolution in the Third Committee, each delegation has received the instructions it needs and I think that to postpone the decision of the General Assembly on this matter would change absolutely nothing, those instructions being what they are. Consequently, hesitation is useless. The General Assembly should decide immediately so that its work may proceed normally. Therefore the delegation of Dahomey opposes any proposal to defer or adjourn the debate.

22. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to support the motion of the Belgian delegation, so eloquently seconded by the Liberian representative.

23. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): If I speak today against the motion to defer the decision on draft resolution III in the report of the Third Committee, it is purely because no reason for the deferment has been given by the proposer or by those who supported him except one—the lack of instructions. I believe that the time that has elapsed between the vote in the Third Committee and our meeting today has been sufficient for any delegation of any country seriously concerned with a problem which is affecting the lives of millions of people to have received instructions. On a question of such importance, importance which is testified to by the presence in this Hall of so many representatives, it is incumbent upon every delegation to try and seek instructions so that the General Assembly may not defer that important question to another year but rather vote upon it at the proper time and in the proper place, which is here today.

24. Secondly, we have all played this game at the United Nations and we know this is merely a manoeuvre to delay, to dissipate time and energy, so that issues which some delegations may not wish to face may be killed by the passage of time. This issue is too important to be deferred and too lively and too burning to be killed by the passage of one year. I would therefore request representatives to vote against the motion for deferment.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We have complied with rule 74 of the rules of procedure: two representatives, in addition to the proposer of the motion, have spoken in favour and two against. A roll-call vote has been requested by the Liberian representative.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Sweden, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland.

Against: Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan.

Abstaining: Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Bhutan, Burma, Chile, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Jamaica, Lesotho, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines.

The motion was rejected by 67 votes to 55, with 15 abstentions.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Belgium on a point of order.

27. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to request formally that the Assembly take a decision on draft resolution III now before us, before a decision is taken on draft resolu-

tions I and II. In rule 91 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly it is stated expressly that

“If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the General Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted.”

The aim of this formal proposal is to make one last effort—I repeat, one last effort—to obtain something that is very dear to our hearts, namely the possibility, in the event of draft resolution III being rejected, of our reaching a consensus on draft resolutions I and II.

28. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has heard the request of the representative of Belgium that priority be given to draft resolution III.

29. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

30. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, it is not at all fair of my good friend the representative of Belgium, to use a French expression, to *mettre des bâtons dans les roues*—to put a spoke in the wheel. Why does he not lose gracefully with the others? This is a parliamentary body. The vote was eloquent. There were 12 more votes for non-postponement than votes of those who wanted to postpone and who have been subjected to pressure during the past three or four days, and even before.

31. Three representatives approached me personally before I came in to this Hall and in an apologetic manner told me that they would like to vote for the draft resolution on zionism but under pressure had received instructions from their Governments to vote for postponement. Is this a game of hide-and-seek?

32. When the partition of Palestine was voted on in 1947, we Arabs thought of walking out of the Assembly, knowing very well that many countries were being subjected to pressure, but we accepted the adverse vote gracefully and did not walk out of the Assembly. Therefore the manoeuvres are continuing, and such manoeuvres will set a precedent we will all regret, because what would prevent any one of us from resorting to such tactics on future draft resolutions if you, Sir, set a precedent such as the one which is demanded by Belgium? I ask you, as our President, to reflect, and I also ask the Assembly to reflect, that this Assembly will vote in favour only under pressure exerted from outside. This point of order, I submit, is creating disorder. Let us vote in an orderly manner, and not go on voting for priorities or for consensus. The consensus is a curse because it serves, not only in this but in other draft resolutions, the common interests of certain States, sacrificing, as it does here, a people that is striving for its independence. If such manoeuvres are resorted to, this session will be thrown into the throes of turmoil and turbulence, which we should avoid.

33. Therefore, summing up, I appeal to all representatives, having heard the Rapporteur present the report, to act in an orderly manner, since each one knows how he is going to vote.

34. Why not lose gracefully? If the Assembly persists in this, I reserve the right to speak again, using procedure, using logic, using anything that comes in handy, to fight the attempts of those who want to

confuse the issue. That is why I appeal to all representatives here to vote in an orderly manner on the draft resolutions as they have been submitted by the Rapporteur. If they do not, God help me, and them too.

35. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I deduce from the intervention of the Saudi Arabian representative that he is against the priority requested by the Belgian representative.

36. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait): In making his exceptional request for exceptional treatment, for deviating from the normal sequence, the Belgian representative had only one justification, and that justification was that this would be one last chance to reach a consensus on the draft resolution regarding the Decade.

37. The justification was the same ultimatum that we have been hearing ever since 16 October, when the Third Committee was first seized of the draft resolution regarding zionism.

38. What do the Belgian representative and the European Economic Community [EEC], in whose name I presume he was speaking, mean by their consensus on the Programme for the Decade? Does he mean words? Is it a verbal vote in support of the Programme for the Decade, or is it action? After all, it is the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. It is action that is the substance of the consensus. Is there anybody in this Hall gullible enough to believe that Belgium would have participated in action in order to combat racism and racial discrimination but for the draft resolution on zionism? Is there anybody in this Hall who is gullible enough to believe that the EEC group of countries would have opposed racism in South Africa actively, by action, were it not for the draft resolution on zionism?

39. The record is clear. Every member of EEC maintains relations with South Africa. The EEC countries make up the majority of the major trading partners of South Africa. All of them voted against the report of the Credentials Committee at the twenty-ninth session rejecting the credentials of South Africa. All of them voted against the suspension of South Africa at the twenty-ninth session. Was the Belgian representative on the verge of coming to this platform—itching to come, dying to come—and saying: “We are going to sever our relations with South Africa, we are going to stop trading with South Africa, we are going to stop being against the suspension of South Africa, if you do not support the draft resolution on zionism”? He said nothing of the sort. The consensus he promised was only a verbal consensus, but the Programme for the Decade is a programme for action. Therefore, the ultimatum of the Belgian representative is irrelevant, and I urge my fellow representatives to vote against it.

40. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As I have no other speakers on my list with regard to the proposal by the Belgian representative that priority be given to draft resolution III, we shall proceed to vote on that motion.

The motion was rejected by 74 votes to 36, with 26 abstentions.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): After the rejection of the motion for deferment and the motion for priority, we come to a further consideration. It was my intention to request the General Assembly to consider that there was no need to discuss the four reports of the Third Committee, and to proceed to the vote. In view of the votes that have just been taken, I feel I must ask the General Assembly whether I am to conclude from the last two votes that there should be a debate on the report submitted at the beginning of this meeting. Two delegations, in fact, have asked to speak in this debate.

42. I would remind the Assembly that rule 66 of the rules of procedure provides that:

“Discussion of a report of a Main Committee in a plenary meeting . . . shall take place if at least one third of the members present and voting at the plenary meeting consider such a discussion to be necessary. Any proposal to this effect shall not be debated but shall be . . . put to the vote.”

43. There have been two requests, one for deferment and one for priority; both have been rejected, and two delegations are now asking to speak in this debate. Does the Assembly see any difficulty in hearing those two delegations that wish to explain their positions? It seems not; therefore I shall call on those two delegations.

44. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): It is symbolic that this debate, which may well prove to be a turning point in the fortunes of the United Nations and a decisive factor as to the possible continued existence of this organization, should take place on 10 November. This night, 37 years ago, has gone down in history as the *Kristallnacht*, or the Night of the Crystals. This was the night of 10 November 1938 when Hitler's Nazi storm-troopers launched a co-ordinated attack on the Jewish community in Germany, burnt the synagogues in all the cities and made bonfires in the streets of the Holy Books and the Scrolls of the Holy Law and the Bible. It was the night when Jewish homes were attacked and heads of families were taken away, many of them never to return. It was the night when the windows of all Jewish businesses and stores were smashed, covering the streets in the cities of Germany with a film of broken glass which dissolved into millions of crystals, giving that night the name of *Kristallnacht*. It was the night which led eventually to the crematoria and the gas-chambers, to Auschwitz, Birkenau, Dachau, Buchenwald, Theresienstadt, and others. It was the night which led to the most terrifying holocaust in the history of man.

45. It is indeed fitting that this draft resolution, conceived in the desire to deflect the Middle East from its moves towards peace and born of a deep, pervading feeling of anti-Semitism, should come up for debate on this day which recalls one of the tragic days in one of the darkest periods of history. It is indeed fitting that the United Nations, which began its life as an anti-Nazi alliance, should, 30 years later, find itself on its way to becoming the world centre of anti-Semitism. Hitler would have felt at home on a number of occasions during the past year, listening to the proceedings in this forum and, above all, to the proceedings during the debate on zionism.

46. It is a sobering reflection indeed to consider to what this body has been dragged down if we are obliged today to contemplate an attack on zionism. For this attack constitutes not only an anti-Semitic attack of the foulest type, but also an attack in this world body on Judaism, one of the oldest-established religions in the world, a religion which has given the world the human values of the Bible, a religion from which two other great religions, Christianity and Islam, sprang. Is it not tragic to consider that we here, at this meeting, in the year 1975, are contemplating what is a scurrilous attack on a great and established religion that has given to the world the Bible with its Ten Commandments; the great prophets of old, Moses, Isaiah, Amos; the great thinkers of history, Maimonides, Spinoza, Marx, Einstein; many of the masters of the arts; and as high a percentage of Nobel Prize winners in the world, in the sciences, the arts and the humanities, as has been achieved by any other people on earth.

47. One can but ponder and wonder at the prospect of countries which consider themselves to be part of the civilized world joining in this first organized attack on an established religion since the Middle Ages. Yes, to these depths are we being dragged by those who propose this draft resolution; to the Middle Ages.

48. The draft resolution before the Third Committee was originally a resolution condemning racism and colonialism, a subject in which consensus could have been achieved, a consensus which is of great importance to all of us and to our African colleagues in particular. However, instead of this being permitted to happen, a group of countries, drunk with the feeling of power inherent in the automatic majority and without regard to the importance of achieving a consensus on this issue, railroaded the Committee in a contemptuous manner by the use of the automatic majority, into bracketing zionism with the subject under discussion. Indeed, it is difficult to speak of this base move with any measure of restraint.

49. I do not come to this rostrum to defend the moral and historical values of the Jewish people. They do not need to be defended. They speak for themselves. They have given to mankind much of what is great and eternal. They have done for the spirit of man more than can readily be appreciated in a forum such as this one.

50. I come here to denounce the two great evils which menace society in general and a society of nations in particular. These two evils are hatred and ignorance. These two evils are the motivating force behind the proponents of this draft resolution and their supporters. These two evils characterize those who would drag this world Organization, the idea of which was first conceived by the prophets of Israel, to the depths to which it has been dragged today.

51. The key to understanding zionism lies in its name. In the Bible, the easternmost of the two hills of ancient Jerusalem was called Zion. The period was the tenth century B.C. In fact, the name “Zion” appears 152 times in the Old Testament referring to Jerusalem. The name is overwhelmingly a poetic and prophetic designation. The religious and emotional qualities of the name arise from the importance of Jerusalem as the Royal City and the City of the Temple. “Mount Zion” is the place where God dwells according to the Bible. Jerusalem or Zion, is a place where the Lord

is King according to Isaiah and where he has installed his King, David, as quoted in the Psalms.

52. King David made Jerusalem the capital of Israel almost 3,000 years ago, and Jerusalem has remained the capital ever since. During the centuries the term "Zion" grew and expanded to mean the whole of Israel. The Israelites in exile could not forget Zion.

53. The Hebrew psalmist sat by the waters of Babylon and swore "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning". This oath has been repeated for thousands of years by Jews throughout the world. It is an oath which was made over 700 years before the advent of Christianity and over 1,200 years before the advent of Islam.

54. In view of all these connotations, Zion came to mean the Jewish homeland, symbolic of Judaism, of Jewish national aspirations.

55. Every Jew, while praying to his God, wherever he is in the world, faces towards Jerusalem. These prayers have expressed for over 2,000 years of exile the yearning of the Jewish people to return to its ancient homeland, Israel. In fact, a continuous Jewish presence, in larger or smaller numbers, has been maintained in the country over the centuries.

56. Zionism is the name of the national movement of the Jewish people and is the modern expression of the ancient Jewish heritage. The Zionist ideal, as set out in the Bible, has been, and is, an integral part of the Jewish religion.

57. Zionism is to the Jewish people what the liberation movements of Africa and Asia have been to their peoples. Zionism is one of the most stirring and constructive national movements in human history. Historically, it is based on a unique and unbroken connexion, extending some 4,000 years, between the People of the Book and the Land of the Bible.

58. In modern times, in the late nineteenth century, spurred by the twin forces of anti-Semitic persecution and of nationalism, the Jewish people organized the Zionist movement in order to transform its dream into reality. Zionism as a political movement was the revolt of an oppressed nation against the depredations and wicked discrimination and oppression of the countries in which anti-Semitism flourished. It is indeed no coincidence at all and not surprising that the sponsors and supporters of this draft resolution include countries which are guilty of the horrible crime of anti-Semitism and discrimination to this very day.

59. Support for the aim of Zionism was written into the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, and was again endorsed by the United Nations in 1947, when the General Assembly voted by an overwhelming majority for the restoration of Jewish independence in our ancient land.

60. The re-establishment of Jewish independence in Israel after centuries of struggle to overcome foreign conquest and exile is 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 is not only to deny to the Jewish people the right accorded to every other people on this globe but is also to deny the central precepts of the United Nations.

61. For Zionism is nothing more—and nothing less—than the Jewish people's sense of origin and destination in the land linked eternally with its name. It is also the instrument whereby the Jewish nation seeks an authentic fulfilment of itself. And the drama is enacted in the region in which the Arab nation has realized its sovereignty in 20 States comprising a hundred million people in four and a half million square miles, with vast resources. The issue therefore is not whether the world will come to terms with Arab nationalism. The question is at what point Arab nationalism, with its prodigious glut of advantage, wealth and opportunity, will come to terms with the modest but equal rights of another Middle Eastern nation to pursue its life in security and peace.

62. The vicious diatribes on Zionism voiced here by Arab representatives may give this Assembly the wrong impression, that while the rest of the world supported the Jewish national liberation movement the Arab world was always hostile to Zionism. That is not the case. Arab leaders, cognizant of the rights of the Jewish people, fully endorsed the virtues of Zionism. Sherif Hussein, the leader of the Arab world during the First World War welcomed the return of the Jews to Palestine. His son, Emir Feisal, who represented the Arab world in the Paris Peace Conference had this to say about Zionism on 3 March 1919:

"We Arabs, especially the educated among us, look with deepest sympathy on the Zionist movement . . . We will wish the Jews a hearty welcome home . . . We are working together for a reformed and revised Near East, and our two movements complement one another. The movement is national and not imperialistic. There is room in Syria for us both. Indeed, I think that neither can be a success without the other."

63. It is perhaps pertinent at this point to recall that in 1947, when the question of Palestine was being debated in the United Nations, the Soviet Union strongly supported the Jewish independence struggle. It is particularly relevant to recall some of Mr. Andrei Gromyko's remarks on 14 May 1947, one day before our independence:

". . . as we know, the aspirations of a considerable part of the Jewish people are linked with the problem of Palestine and of its future administration. This fact scarcely requires proof. . . ."

"During the last war, the Jewish people underwent exceptional sorrow and suffering. Without any exaggeration, this sorrow and suffering are indescribable. It is difficult to express them in dry statistics on the Jewish victims of the fascist aggressors. The Jews in the territories where the Hitlerites held sway were subjected to almost complete physical annihilation. The total number of members of the Jewish population who perished at the hands of the Nazi executioners is estimated at approximately six million. . . ."

" . . ."

" . . . the United Nations cannot and must not regard this situation with indifference, since this would be incompatible with the high principles proclaimed in its Charter, which provides for the defence of human rights, irrespective of race, religion or sex. . . ."

“The fact that no western European State has been able to ensure the defence of the elementary rights of the Jewish people, and to safeguard it against the violence of the fascist executioners, explains the aspirations of the Jews to establish their own State. It would be unjust not to take this into consideration and to deny the right of the Jewish people to realize this aspiration.”¹

Those were the words of Mr. Andrei Gromyko at the General Assembly session on 14 May 1947.

64. How sad it is to see here a group of nations, many of whom have but recently freed themselves from colonial rule, deriding one of the most noble liberation movements of this century, a movement which not only gave an example of encouragement and determination to the peoples struggling for independence, but also actively aided many of them during the period of preparation for their independence or immediately thereafter.

65. Here you have a movement, which is the embodiment of a unique pioneering spirit, of the dignity of labour, and of enduring human values, a movement which has presented to the world an example of social equality and open democracy, being associated in this resolution with abhorrent political concepts.

66. We in Israel have endeavoured to create a society which strives to implement the highest ideals of society—political, social and cultural—for all the inhabitants of Israel, irrespective of religious belief, race or sex. Show me another pluralistic society in this world in which, despite all the difficult problems among which we live, Jew and Arab live together with such a degree of harmony, in which the dignity and rights of man are observed before the law, in which no death sentence is applied, in which freedom of speech, of movement, of thought, of expression are guaranteed, in which even movements which are opposed to our national aims are represented in our Parliament.

67. The Arab delegates talk of racism. It lies not in their mouths. What has happened to the 800,000 Jews who lived for over 2,000 years in the Arab lands, who formed some of the most ancient communities long before the advent of Islam? Where are those communities? What happened to the people, what happened to their property?

68. The Jews were once one of the important communities in the countries of the Middle East, the leaders of thought, of commerce, of medical science. Where are they in Arab society today? You dare talk of racism when I can point with pride to the Arab Ministers who have served in my Government; to the Arab deputy speaker of my Parliament; to Arab officers and men serving of their own volition in our defence, border and police forces, frequently commanding Jewish troops; to the hundreds of thousands of Arabs from all over the Middle East crowding the cities of Israel every year; to the thousands of Arabs from all over the Middle East coming for medical treatment to Israel; to the peaceful coexistence which has developed; to the fact that Arabic is an official language in Israel on a par with Hebrew; to the fact that it is as natural for an Arab to serve in public office in Israel as it is incongruous to think of a Jew serving in any public office in any Arab country—indeed,

being admitted to many of them. Is that racism? It is not. That is zionism.

69. It is our attempt to build a society, imperfect though it may be—and what society is perfect?—in which the visions of the prophets of Israel will be realized. I know that we have problems. I know that many disagree with our Government's policies. Many in Israel, too, disagree from time to time with the Government's policies, and are free to do so because zionism has created the first and only real democratic State in a part of the world that never really knew democracy and freedom of speech.

70. This malicious resolution, designed to divert us from its true purpose, is part of a dangerous anti-Semitic idiom which is being insinuated into every public debate by those who have sworn to block the current move towards accommodation and ultimately towards peace in the Middle East. This, together with similar moves, is designed to sabotage the efforts of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East and to deflect those who are moving along the road towards peace from their purpose. But they will not succeed, for I can but reiterate my Government's policy to make every move in the direction towards peace, based on compromise.

71. We are seeing here today but another manifestation of the bitter anti-Semitic, anti-Jewish hatred which animates Arab society. Who would have believed that in the year 1975 the malicious falsehoods of the Elders of Zion would be distributed officially by Arab Governments? Who would have believed that we would today contemplate an Arab society which teaches the vilest anti-Jewish hate in the kindergartens? Who would have believed that an Arab head of State would feel obliged to indulge publicly in anti-Semitism of the cheapest nature when visiting a friendly nation? We are being attacked by a society which is motivated by the most extreme form of racism known in the world today. This is the racism which was expressed so succinctly in the words of the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], Yasser Arafat, in his opening address at a symposium in Tripoli, Libya, and I quote: “There will be no presence in the region except for the Arab presence”. In other words, in the Middle East, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, only one presence is allowed, and that is the Arab presence. No other people, regardless of how deep are its roots in the region, is to be permitted to enjoy its right of self-determination.

72. Look at the tragic fate of the Kurds of Iraq. Look at what happened to the black population in southern Sudan. Look at the dire peril in which an entire community of Christians finds itself in Lebanon. Look at the avowed policy of the PLO, which calls, in its Palestine Covenant, for the destruction of the State of Israel, which denies any form of compromise on the Palestine issue, and which, in the words of its representative only the other day in this building, considers Tel Aviv to be occupied territory. Look at all this and you see before you the root cause of the pernicious resolution brought before the Assembly. You see the twin evils of this world at work: the blind hatred of the Arab proponents of this resolution, and the abysmal ignorance and wickedness of those who support them.

73. The issue before the Assembly is not Israel and is not zionism. The issue is the fate of the Organization. Conceived in the spirit of the prophets of Israel, born out of an anti-Nazi alliance after the tragedy of the Second World War, it has degenerated into a forum which was this last week described by one of the leading writers in a foremost organ of social and liberal thought in the West as, and I quote,

“rapidly becoming one of the most corrupt and corrupting creations in the whole history of human institutions . . . almost without exception those in the majority come from States notable for racist oppression of every conceivable hue . . .”

He goes on to explain the phenomenon of this debate:

“Israel is a social democracy, the nearest approach to a free socialist State in this world; its people and Government have a profound respect for human life, so passionate indeed that, despite every conceivable provocation, they have refused for a quarter of a century to execute a single captured terrorist. They also have an ancient but vigorous culture, and a flourishing technology. The combination of national qualities they have assembled in their brief existence as a State is a perpetual and embittering reproach to most of the new countries whose representatives swagger about the United Nations building. So Israel is envied and hated, and efforts are made to destroy her. The extermination of the Israelis has long been the prime objective of the Terrorist International; they calculate that if they can break Israel, then all the rest of civilization is vulnerable to their assaults”.

And then he goes on to conclude:

“The melancholy truth, I fear, is that the candles of civilization are burning low. The world is increasingly governed not so much by capitalism, or communism, or social democracy, or even tribal barbarism, as by a false lexicon of political clichés, accumulated over half a century and now assuming a kind of degenerate sacerdotal authority . . . We all know what they are . . .”

74. Over the centuries it has fallen to the lot of my people to be the testing agent of human decency, the touchstone of civilization, the crucible in which enduring human values are to be tested. A nation's level of humanity could invariably be judged by its behaviour towards its Jewish population. It always began with the Jews but never ended with them.

75. The anti-Jewish pogroms in Czarist Russia were but the tip of the iceberg which revealed the inherent rottenness of the régime which was soon to disappear in the storm of revolution. The anti-Semitic excesses of the Nazis merely foreshadowed the catastrophe which was to befall mankind in Europe.

76. This wicked resolution must sound the alarm for all decent people in the world. The Jewish people as a testing agent has unfortunately never erred. The implications inherent in this shameful move are terrifying indeed.

77. On this issue, the world as represented in this Hall has divided itself into good and bad, decent and evil, human and debased. We, the Jewish people, will recall in history our gratitude to those nations who stood up and were counted and who refused to support

this wicked proposition. I know that this episode will have strengthened the forces of freedom and decency in the world and will have fortified them in their resolve to strengthen the ideals they so value. I know that this episode will have strengthened zionism, as it has weakened the United Nations.

78. As I stand on this rostrum, the long and proud history of my people unravels itself before my inward eye. I see the oppressors of our people over the ages as they pass one after another in evil procession into oblivion. I stand here before you as the representative of a strong and flourishing people which has survived them all and which will survive this shameful exhibition and the proponents of this resolution. I stand here as the representative of a people one of whose prophets gave to this world the sublime prophecy which animated the founders of this world organization and which graces the entrance to this building: “. . . nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” [Isaiah 2:4.] In the verses before that, the prophet Isaiah proclaimed: “And it shall come to pass in the last days . . . for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” [Isaiah 2:2-3.]

79. As I stand on this rostrum, the great moments of Jewish history come to mind as I face you, once again outnumbered and the would-be victim of hate, ignorance and evil. I look back on those great moments. I recall the greatness of a nation which I have the honour to represent in this forum. I am mindful at this moment of the Jewish people throughout the world wherever they may be, be it in freedom or in slavery, whose prayers and thoughts are with me at this moment.

80. I stand not here as a supplicant. Vote as your moral conscience dictates to you. For the issue is not Israel or zionism. The issue is the continued existence of the Organization, which has been dragged to its lowest point of discredit by a coalition of despotisms and racists.

81. The vote of each delegation will record in history its country's stand on anti-Semitic racism and anti-Judaism. You yourselves bear the responsibility for your stand before history, for as such will you be viewed in history. But we, the Jewish people, will not forget.

82. For us, the Jewish people, this is but a passing episode in a rich and an event-filled history. We put our trust in our Providence, in our faith and beliefs, in our time-hallowed tradition, in our striving for social advance and human values and in our people wherever they may be. For us, the Jewish people, this resolution, based on hatred, falsehood and arrogance, is devoid of any moral or legal value. For us, the Jewish people, this is no more than a piece of paper, and we shall treat it as such.

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before I call on the representative of Dahomey, I wish to remind the Assembly that he is the last speaker on the list, and also that, under the powers vested in me under rule 73 of the rules of procedure, I now close the list of speakers. The representative of Dahomey will, therefore, be the last speaker. There is all the more reason for doing so since we have 24 names on the list of speakers in explanation of vote.

84. Mr. ADJIBADÉ (Dahomey) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to express my delegation's thanks to the Rapporteur of the Third Committee for the clear and precise report which she has just presented to the Assembly on the work of the Third Committee.

85. Our statement will deal essentially with draft resolution III in the report on item 68 [A/10320]. From the time that the Third Committee at its 2134th meeting adopted this draft resolution [A/C.3/L.2159], which in its only operative paragraph considers zionism as a form of racial discrimination, there has been feverish activity by certain delegations—delegations which, in any case, would not wish to see unveiled the true objectives of this famous national movement of the Jewish people known as zionism. From that moment, those who have no choice but to rush to the aid of their allies and vassals—and that includes a super-Power—unleashed a tremendous campaign of manoeuvres, consisting of uttering threats, hurling insults and exerting pressure of all kinds to induce certain delegations to change their votes when the draft resolution came before the Assembly for adoption.

86. Similarly, Israel, which is directly concerned, is engaged in frantic conjectures and explanations, seeking by every means to cleanse zionism of all racist taints. Thus, after the attempt to confuse zionism with Judaism, there was no hesitation in associating it with the liberation movements. At the outset, the delegation of Dahomey would like vigorously to denounce and condemn these base delaying tactics designed to make us believe that zionism is inspired and organized by virtuous angels who are persecuted and dispersed throughout the world and who should at all costs be gathered together and saved from distress. To accept such allegations would be proof of ignorance and frivolity.

87. How are we to regard a situation in which, on the one hand, zionism is encouraging colonialism through the settlement of Palestine by Jews, while, on the other hand, Palestinians are being refused the right to return to their homeland and to recover their homes and property? How would representatives describe such a practice? True, in essence, zionism is not related to *apartheid*, but in its manifestations zionism is easily comparable to racism and racial discrimination, as witness the economic, political and cultural links existing between the racist régime in South Africa, the wars of aggression perpetrated by the Zionist régime against the Arab peoples—wars that are guided by a policy of territorial expansion—and the racist policy practised by the Zionist régime in the occupied territories.

88. As long as the Palestinian problem lasts, my delegation will never tire of condemning zionism as a form of racism. It is undoubtedly no accident that all international conferences, and especially the World Conference of the International Women's Year, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, were careful, after having analysed the extent of the persecutions undergone by the Palestinians at the hands of the Jews, to link zionism with racist policies and to condemn it with the same vigour as they condemn *apartheid*.

89. Dahomey respects Judaism just as it respects any other religion, and has nothing against the Jewish people, which has had to suffer Nazi atrocities; but we reject zionism as a racist, expansionist ideology in its manifestations. It is not normal that, after having left this land so many centuries ago, the Jewish people should return to it thanks to the United Nations and, by a stroke of irony, relentlessly expel the indigenous inhabitants, merely because they—the Jews—enjoy the benefit of force and of the financial and logistical support of an over-fed and over-equipped super-Power.

90. My delegation is not going to hark back to the statements made by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic, Egypt, Jordan and Iraq during the debate on the issue in the Third Committee. They are eloquent enough and are a testimony to the misdeeds of zionism and to its ramifications in the Israel-Arab conflict.

91. In adopting draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 despite the vigorous pressure exerted by certain delegations, the Third Committee fulfilled its task completely and showed the international community that the question of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination should not be limited to South Africa but should extend as well to all ideologies tending to promote racism, segregation or any other form of racial discrimination, however pure they may claim to be from the conceptual point of view.

92. Thus it is up to the General Assembly merely to endorse the Third Committee's decision in connexion with draft resolution III in its report [A/10320].

93. Let us have no further delay. It is useless to put off voting on this matter, because whether we vote today or tomorrow, nothing will alter the result, since every delegation has received full instructions from its Government. It is high time that countries that prize peace and justice and forthrightly and firmly oppose racism, segregationism and racial discrimination in all their forms gave proof of their honesty by supporting this draft resolution, which states that zionism should be seen as it really is.

94. In any case, as far as Dahomey is concerned, we shall remain faithful to our options by denouncing and struggling against injustice, racism and colonialism wherever these scourges may exist, whether they are perpetrated by a super-Power, a middle-sized or a small Power. If, in confirming our vote on this draft resolution, we run the risk of seeing the United Nations break down, or of causing the Programme of Action of the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to fail, it is with full awareness that we assume our responsibilities, because rather than seeing the United Nations survive bogged down in compromise, we prefer to see the United Nations dead—to see it break down for having defended and brought about the triumph of truth and justice. In this regard, and in order to make very clear the position of Dahomey, I would recall what I said in the First Committee on 22 October 1975:

“Dahomey is devoted to the United Nations and will spare no effort to strengthen its role, but if perchance some Powers which preach democracy so skilfully prevent the application of democratic rules whenever they go against their interests, even

when this might mean the breakdown of the United Nations, we should like to say once and for all that if because of the folly of the great Powers or the super-Powers the United Nations is brought down or is no longer able to function, that will not be the end of the smaller countries, in particular Dahomey; those that will suffer the most will be the major Powers because of the special responsibilities which, rightly or wrongly, you claim as yours. You would do well to think carefully if it is really your intention to bring about the downfall of the United Nations or to cut off the funds which are necessary for its functioning.”²

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We come now to the explanations of vote before the vote. I shall call first on representatives wishing to explain their votes on one or more of the five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report [A/10320]. We shall then vote on the five draft resolutions separately. Representatives wishing to explain their votes after the vote will have an opportunity to do so after all draft resolutions have been put to the vote.

96. The Reverend NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The draft resolutions before us actually constitute a single whole, since each seeks support from the others and any one of those draft resolutions that is weak in terms of its ethical basis weakens the ethical value of the others.

97. Draft resolution III presents an ethical dimension of such magnitude that it obscures any other political aspect one might wish to ascribe to it. My delegation considers draft resolution III in the light primarily of certain spiritual and ethical values represented by distinguished leaders of the Catholic and Protestant Churches who met last week in the city of Memphis in Tennessee and addressed a letter to the Secretary-General with reference to this infamous draft resolution, in which they said: “To compare zionism with racism is a calumny against the Jews and a return to the old anti-Semitism that was a scourge of mankind for centuries.”

98. Another leader of the Catholic Church, Monsignor Donnellan of Atlanta, vigorously denounced the anti-Zionist proposal and asserted: “It is not in keeping with reality. It is diabolical and should be denounced and repudiated wherever it raises its head.”

99. Anti-Semitism or any attitude provoking anti-Semitism is therefore regarded today by the Christian churches—and on this my Government agrees—as an attack against a people which has given the world a religion that has been the basis for other religions, among them my own faith and the Muslim faith to which the large majority of the co-sponsors of the anti-Semitic draft resolution belong. I ask my Muslim brothers to ponder this truth and, rising above political expediency, to do honour to the transcendental values of our own common spiritual ideology.

100. In my youth I learned that the supreme objective of the Zionist movement was not merely to re-construct the State of Israel and consolidate it but rather to solve the problem of the Jewish people. The State it was to construct and that it constructed was only instrumental as a means towards finding a solution to the wider problem. So long as there exist in the

world manifestations and vestiges of anti-Semitism, the Zionist movement has a purpose to fulfil.

101. I therefore believe that the anti-Semitic draft resolution adopted in the Third Committee, which it is now sought to have adopted in the General Assembly, demonstrates quite clearly the need for the hard struggle that zionism must still wage before it achieves its ultimate goals in favour of its Jewish people.

102. The discussion of the draft resolution must also take into account the purposes for which the United Nations was created. The Charter states that its objective is “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.”

103. Is there a single representative in this Assembly who, before God, can declare that the proposed anti-Semitic resolution fulfils any of the objectives of the Charter? I would add that there are representatives here who have deleted the word “God” from their dictionaries, and I would ask them whether there is any one of them who can stand before the tribunal of his own conscience and, without blushing, declare that the anti-Zionist vote does not violate the fundamental principles of the Organization and, what is more, the noble humanist ideals that form part of the ideology on which its Member States were founded.

104. May I be permitted to say that there is a vain illusion among those representatives who believe that by voting for the anti-Zionist draft resolution—which Costa Rica will vote against—they will be harming the Jewish people, the Zionist movement or the State of Israel? On the contrary, this Third Committee draft resolution, if adopted here, will serve as a warning to the Jewish people to intensify their Zionist activities and as a warning to all the free peoples of the world that the Hitlerite and fascist evil has not yet been eradicated from the face of the earth.

105. Who will the adoption of the draft resolution really harm? The one that will suffer most from this absurd battle will be the United Nations itself, whose Charter is being so blatantly violated.

106. The contents of draft resolution III should also be viewed against the background of history and it is in that light that my delegation considers it. The Zionist movement historically represents the authentic rebellion of a people that, tired of persecution and insults for so many centuries and of participating in the revolutions of the world which freed other peoples, decided one day to start its own revolution of national redemption.

107. The truth is that the Jews participated and sacrificed their lives in many revolutions for human freedom. They took part in the American Revolution, in the French Revolution, and to a large extent in the Russian Revolution. Let us now have the courage to say and acknowledge that they were betrayed by almost all revolutions, which were unable or did not wish to solve the Jewish problem, which represents the age-old suffering of an entire people. That is why they listened to the voice of their prophets who preached the return to Zion. That is why they rebuilt their State on the lands of Israel—lands which, were they able to speak, would not do so in the Roman,

Arabic, Turkish or English language, but in the age-old Hebrew tongue.

108. But it is not only my heart as a priest which speaks to you. As a representative of Costa Rica at this time I have been charged by the Minister for External Relations of my country to put before this Assembly his strong and firm views on this subject. To use his words:

“First, the delegation of Costa Rica has been given instructions by the Ministry to oppose the unjustified amendments which include zionism among forms of racial discrimination. In the event that they should be adopted, Costa Rica will have the painful duty of voting against the draft resolution condemning racism which contains such a reference. Of course, this negative vote will not alter the fact that our country has always distinguished itself in the struggle against all forms of racial discrimination, and that, furthermore, we are proud that we practise tolerance and treat all the races that live in our midst and are our people on an equal footing.

“Secondly, I believe that the attack on Zionism is a euphemistic way of reviving anti-Semitism, which led to the horrors of the Nazi era before and during the Second World War. Therefore, apart from being ironical, it is demeaning to find that a document condemning racism and all forms of racial discrimination should seek to justify and encourage hatred against the Jewish race.

“Thirdly, Zionism is the liberation movement of a people which for centuries was subjugated to colonial yoke and racial persecution. It was created to provide the Jewish people with its own State. Thus it is equally ironical, as well as being a cause for indignation, to find that many Member States of the so-called non-aligned group, which claim to be champions of anti-colonialism and which owe their existence to the efforts of young national liberation movements, should now attack zionism, the oldest of all those liberating movements.”

109. On behalf of a democratic people and Government, I appeal to representatives sponsoring this draft resolution of infamy and provocation to withdraw it from our agenda. There is still time to avoid this blot on the Organization. There is still time for us to be worthy of the faith and hopes that the peoples of the world have placed in us.

110. Those peoples expect us at this time, when we come to approve the draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee, to adopt unanimously a declaration of war on racism of which so many peoples are and have been the victims—among them, of course, the Jewish people dispersed among all nations. We are ready to fulfil that expectation in a vigorous resolution of the General Assembly such as those in draft resolutions I and II. But our hearts are heavy to think that these two valuable draft resolutions are affected by the content of the third draft resolution. Why should we have to go against conscience by being forced to accept a conceptual aberration and a human injustice that condemns a people to continue its painful pilgrimage through the world at the same time as other peoples, which have suffered as much and continue to suffer from racial discrimination and injustice, are

given a message of hope and a guarantee of equality by us?

111. Costa Rica is proud of its democratic way of life, but it will have to vote against this draft resolution of infamy and anti-Semitism and against any other group of draft resolutions that have any connexion with this wicked affront to the noble Zionist movement. My delegation regrets that the noble African peoples, which have placed such great faith in the declaration of war on racism, to which Costa Rica was the first to subscribe, may now find themselves deceived by the blindness of those who seek to mix a just cause with the most unjust of causes in this group of draft resolutions, which cannot be considered in isolation or separately.

112. If the Arab Governments and the PLO believe that, should the anti-Zionist draft resolution be adopted, they will have achieved the greatest of successes, I venture very respectfully but strongly to warn them that by adopting this draft resolution, which is an unbridled invitation to genocide against the Jewish people and to reopening chapters of history of pain and persecution for that people, they will have ensured the greatest failure for those who support it. It does honour neither to those representatives nor to their Governments. Some day, when people can freely express their views, they will accuse them of betraying the conscience of mankind, which aspires to a better world of peace, justice and human dignity.

113. In conclusion, and on behalf of my people and Government, allow me to address a few words to my Jewish brothers. If a majority in this Assembly adopts this diabolical draft resolution which condemns them to further persecution, they must not be dismayed. I say to them: Continue to fight, strong in heart, for your sacred ideals and yearnings, for your unforgettable Zion. Nothing and no one can stop you, for your struggle for national redemption is not yours alone but that of all free men of good will. In your long history you have survived worse resolutions than this, and you will also survive this one. Do not lose faith or hope in a better world or in human decency. Let your children and the children of your children continue to set an example of heroic and constant affirmation of human dignity until the final redemption of the whole of mankind.

114. Mr. WILSON (Liberia): The delegation of Liberia was one of the 20 African countries south of the Sahara that did not support draft resolution III, which is now called the resolution on zionism.

115. In their attempt to equate zionism with racism, some of the sponsors of the draft resolution made some brilliant statements in order to prove their thesis. As I listened attentively to all those eloquent statements, it seemed as though the sponsors were competing with each other as to which one was eloquent enough to convince the Committee that zionism is racism. Anxiously, I waited in vain for a definition of racism as it relates to zionism, but no definition was given.

116. *Apartheid*, or racism as it applies to South Africa, has a definite connotation which relates to the separation of the races on the basis of the colour of their skin. Is this true of zionism?

117. During the debate in the Third Committee, some of us were very much surprised and bitterly disappointed to observe that in all those brilliant and eloquent statements not one word was said about the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which is designed to help our brothers and sisters, some of whom are now languishing in the prisons in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. It was most regrettable, indeed, that the Programme for the Decade, which we cherish so dearly, was completely overshadowed by the question of equating zionism with racism. If a member of the racist régime of South Africa had been present at that meeting he would probably have danced with joy.

118. When the Decade was launched a few years ago, all the resolutions concerning the Decade were adopted by consensus. Consequently, the delegation of Liberia had fervently hoped that the tradition of voting by consensus would have been maintained. Unfortunately, and most regrettably, this draft resolution which equates zionism with racism completely shattered that tradition. Not only that, it also affected the unity of the African group, which has always put up a united front on all resolutions dealing with the Decade. Is this the intention of the sponsors?

119. During the debate in the Third Committee on the draft resolution on zionism, the Western European countries made it abundantly and perfectly clear that if that draft resolution were adopted and brought to the plenary Assembly, not only would they vote against it, but they would also vote against the two draft resolutions on the Decade which were recommended by the Economic and Social Council. If that were to happen, it would definitely have a disastrous effect on the Programme for the Decade, which is designed not only to help the victims of *apartheid* but also to educate our youth in the spirit of equality and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

120. It is a historic fact that anti-Semitism gave birth to the zionist movement. Between the years 613 and 1402, the Jews were expelled twice from Spain, and they were also expelled from England, France and Austria. In 1890, an Anti-Semitic Party, which lasted until 1935, was formed in Germany.

121. Even though the Zionist movement was founded in 1897, many Jews throughout the world hesitated to join it or be associated with it, probably because they were not too sure whether the idea of the Jewish homeland would materialize. But because of the tragedy of the Jews in Nazi Germany, many Jews throughout the world embraced the movement. They did so not because of racism, but because the very survival of the Jewish people was at stake.

122. Zionism, as it is known to many Christians all over the world, has a deep spiritual meaning. The fact that the sponsors have ignored this particular aspect of zionism is no surprise to us. The spiritual and moral aspect of zionism was stressed a few days ago by Bishop Ralph Ward, President of the Bishops of the United Methodist Church. He said: "Zionism means much more than a political entity. It implies moral and spiritual values, characteristic of the Jewish people through the ages."

123. The adoption of this draft resolution might be considered by some of its sponsors as a victory for their cause. No, it will not be a victory for them. But it will be a victory for the racist régime of South Africa, because it will definitely kill the Programme for the Decade. Is this the intention of the sponsors?

124. I am not a prophet, and I am not endowed with the powers of a clairvoyant. But it is reasonable to assume that if this draft resolution were to be adopted it might have a disastrous effect on this Organization and might tarnish its image very badly.

125. In conclusion, I should like to say that the delegation of Liberia will not support this draft resolution on zionism.

126. Mr. PETRIĆ (Yugoslavia): My delegation is voting in favour of draft resolution III. Not having participated in the debate in the Third Committee, we feel constrained to explain our vote. Also, we are doing so because of the special situation that has been created and because of the various interpretations, uses and misuses that in this connexion are being indulged in in various quarters. We do not want anyone to misunderstand our position.

127. Let me start by reminding everyone here of the unchanged position of Yugoslavia on the Middle East crisis, namely, that only within the framework of a settlement based on the withdrawal of Israel from all the territories occupied after 5 June 1967 and the realization of the legitimate and inalienable national rights of the Arab people in Palestine, including the right to establish its own State, can the independent and secure existence of all peoples and States in the region be guaranteed. Yugoslavia remains ready to extend its maximum contribution to such an outcome of the Middle East crisis.

128. We must reiterate our deepest conviction that the gravest responsibility rests with Israel, because of its continued refusal to respect and implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Israel's refusal not only delays the settlement of the crisis and the establishment of a durable peace in the Middle East; it is at the same time the chief cause provoking tensions and explosions around this issue in the region and beyond.

129. In voting for the draft resolution on zionism—obviously, as it is practised today in assisting Israel's aggressive, annexationist policies that deprive another people of its national rights in Palestine—our stand must be taken as meaning the condemnation of such Israeli aggression, and condemnation as well of any action, anywhere in the world, in any country, that supports such discriminatory Israeli behaviour towards the Arabs of Palestine. This position of ours is not directed against the Jews, either in Israel or elsewhere. We are stating this with complete moral authority, for the Yugoslav peoples—who, during their national war of liberation suffered the terrible loss of 1.7 million dead—deeply sympathized with the suffering of the Jewish people, many of whom had fought side by side with the other Yugoslavs—and continue, as always, to respect that people whose sons and daughters were killed in the millions by German and other fascists, in the Nazi anti-Jewish campaign of liquidation in the infamous Nazi death-camps of

Dachau, Auschwitz, Mauthausen, Treblinka and Belsen among others, together with millions of others.

130. The attempts to ascribe to this resolution an anti-Semitic character or motivation have a very transparent aim: to equate with anti-Semitism the just condemnation of Israel's aggression and the extending of support to the just liberation struggle of the Arab peoples. Indeed, the accusations of anti-Semitism are an insult to those countries that vote for it. My country was a victim of Nazism, which started its enslaving conquest with the slogan of anti-Semitism, and therefore it is absurd to impute anti-Semitism to us.

131. In concluding, let me again state our deep belief that the situation would fundamentally change for the better all round, for everyone, as soon as Israel vacates the Arab territories occupied in 1967; as soon as it recognizes the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the establishment of its own State; and as soon as it recognizes the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, and recognizes its right to participate as an equal in all stages of the comprehensive solving of the Middle East crisis.

132. It is in such a situation that the right of all States in the Middle East, including the State of Israel, to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the right to live in peace and security, can be safeguarded by effective international guarantees.

133. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Delegations will recall that on the draft resolution regarding zionism, when that matter was being considered by the Third Committee on 17 October, my delegation explained its vote before the vote³ and did actually vote affirmatively on the draft in strict accordance with the instructions it had then received from the Government of Mauritius. This morning, one of the several Ambassadors of perhaps the largest delegation in the United Nations—which I shall not name, so as not to cause any embarrassment or to give away any bilateral secret—telephoned me to inform me that the Ambassador of her country accredited to my capital had received from my Government a clear assurance that my delegation here at the United Nations would shift its position and vote negatively on the draft resolution regarding zionism recommended by the Third Committee.

134. The lines of communication of some delegations are obviously better than those of others. I say this—and I do so for the sake of the record of this Assembly—because I have not, up to this moment, received any instructions from my Government to vote negatively on the Third Committee's recommendation. I shall therefore continue to vote strictly in accordance with the instructions I have actually so far received.

135. It seems to me that pressure, coercion, threats, obnoxious language and the arrogant, patronizing attitude of the representatives of some big, developed countries have, for quite some time now, ceased to have much effect on the small, developing countries, independent and sovereign States Members of the United Nations.

136. If there is going to be any shift of position of any delegation at this stage, I should like to believe

that it will be as a result of better communications between delegations and their respective capitals, based on wisdom derived from further study by their respective Governments, acting independently, and not as a result of pressure. To believe otherwise would be, to say the least, pretentious.

137. I am satisfied that I have done my best to bring about a compromise. I admit that I have failed. I have failed mainly because of two words that were used by two representatives of one country. They chose to describe the action of 70 independent, sovereign countries as obscene and, by implication, described those same countries as indecent and not to be counted among one's friends. Many are those delegations which would have changed their position were it not for those two words.

138. How sad, how unfortunate, how costly for the United Nations.

139. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): It is with great reluctance that New Zealand is obliged to withdraw the support which it gave in the Third Committee to the first two draft resolutions relating to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. As a multi-racial society in which racial equality is firmly established both in principle and in practice, New Zealand welcomed the adoption by consensus of resolution 2919 (XXVII), in which the Assembly proclaimed a Decade of concentrated action to eliminate racism. New Zealand firmly supported the objectives of the Programme of Action as laid down in resolution 3057 (XXVIII), and the specific policies which the New Zealand Government has instituted to give concrete expression to its total opposition to discrimination based on race, wherever it may occur, have left our commitment in no doubt.

140. The New Zealand delegation deeply regrets that the decision of the Third Committee to recommend a third draft resolution under this item, a draft which changes the fundamental character of the Decade, compels us to change our vote. We were firmly opposed to the introduction of this draft resolution in the Third Committee, and we emphasized then that, despite the great importance we attach to the promotion of effective action to combat the very real racial discrimination that exists in more than one part of the world, the adoption of this draft resolution would oblige us to reconsider our attitude to the Decade.

141. There may be more than one opinion as to what zionism is, or as to what its effects are. We simply cannot accept, however, that zionism constitutes a form of racial discrimination comparable to, for example, *apartheid*, which is the kind of doctrine and practice that have been universally accepted as racist.

142. The controversial characterization of zionism as a racist doctrine, an issue on which the General Assembly is deeply divided, will not in any way advance the objectives of the Decade. On the contrary, it will destroy the consensus which has hitherto existed and will place the remainder of the Decade in jeopardy. As far as New Zealand is concerned, if the adoption of draft resolution III results in the introduction into the programme of activities aimed against zionism, we shall not participate in those activities

and shall be obliged to review our attitude to the Decade as a whole.

143. Of even greater concern are the wider implications. The adoption of this draft resolution would call into question the ability of the United Nations to fulfil one of its primary responsibilities—the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Since 1972 the degree of unanimity with which the international community has supported the Decade has testified to the effective way in which all Members of the United Nations, regardless of ideology or state of development, are still able to act in concert to achieve agreed goals. This collective action to combat racism has provided a shining example of the continuing effectiveness of the United Nations in the face of criticism from many quarters.

144. The divisive and negative effects of the adoption of this draft resolution would not necessarily be confined to the fight against racial discrimination and the promotion of human rights. It might well affect the willingness of Members to work together in other fields and could shake the stability of the Organization itself.

145. The New Zealand delegation appeals to all Members not to imperil the opportunity which still exists for us to move forward together to eliminate the scourge of racism and to implement the human rights provisions of the Charter.

146. New Zealand, for its part, will abstain on draft resolutions I and II and will vote against draft resolution III. We shall maintain our abstention on draft resolution IV, in view of the legal difficulties we have with the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. We shall maintain our support for draft resolution V.

147. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I wish to explain why the United Kingdom will vote against draft resolutions I, II and III, which are now recommended to us for adoption by the Third Committee under item 68 (a) of our agenda.

148. The United Kingdom supported draft resolutions I and II when they were voted on in the Third Committee, as we did in the Economic and Social Council when the resolutions were adopted by consensus. I would have wished that I could have done the same this afternoon.

149. We have supported the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination since its inception three years ago. If I may, I should like to pay a tribute to the delegations of Ghana and Egypt, in particular, which have made the major contributions in ensuring that the Decade commands the support the importance of its subject warrants.

150. As those of us who have followed the preparations for the Decade will already know, for our part we have been ready to play an active role in the conference planned for 1978 in Accra. We have until now co-operated fully in the other activities under the Decade and in its Programme.

151. Our hopes of continuing this co-operation were shattered on 17 October when certain delegations saw fit to change the agreed basis of the Decade. After the Third Committee debate, the whole thrust and the whole character of the proposal has been altered. It

has now been transformed into a decade against zionism.

152. My country cannot accept this mutation. We are compelled therefore to address ourselves to a situation in which draft resolutions I and II are overtly linked to draft resolution III. No delegation will, I trust, suggest that we for our part have not given ample and clear warning of the consequences that the passing of draft resolution III would have on our attitude towards the Decade. Indeed, the representative of Italy, in the agreed statements he made in the Third Committee on behalf of the nine countries of EEC,⁴ spelled this out on two separate occasions when he said that the passage of draft resolution III would mean that the Nine—all of them—would no longer be able to support the Decade against racism.

153. At this moment the United Nations is still faced with the possibility that the General Assembly will accept the Third Committee's recommendation to adopt draft resolution III.

154. My country is opposed to the adoption of that draft resolution for three main reasons.

155. First, we consider that to stigmatize zionism as racism is, as the International Commission of Jurists has pointed out, to confuse racism and racial discrimination with nationalism. Such a confusion can serve only to undermine the right of the State of Israel to exist and the United Kingdom categorically rejects and will oppose any such move. I should like too to reiterate the declaration made on behalf of the nine countries of EEC, that we totally reject any notion that zionism is racism. The United Kingdom stands by that statement. It represents our view today.

156. The second reason why my country is opposed to this draft resolution is that in our view it can only add to the difficulties of attaining a peaceful settlement in the Middle East; and, Heaven knows, it is difficult enough already.

157. Finally, my Government believes that the United Nations offers a unique forum for harmonizing the interests of our different nations. Britain has exerted and we shall continue to exert our efforts towards this end, whether it be over decolonization, over economic co-operation, over the issues of international peace and security which come before the Security Council, or over issues concerning human rights.

158. But by its very nature the United Nations cannot succeed in an atmosphere of discord and division. We should surely be trying to lessen differences, not to provoke them. We believe that the move to equate zionism with racism and racial discrimination is precisely the sort of resolution which is unhelpful in this regard. Capriciously introduced and wantonly pursued, it has proved the most divisive issue of this Assembly. It may well lose support for the Decade against racism. It has certainly exacerbated our differences. It risks bringing this whole organization into disrepute. It is exactly the wrong issue, raised in the wrong way and at the wrong time, and we will have none of it at all. Britain cannot prevent the eventual passage of this draft resolution if that is the real wish of the majority of the nations assembled here. But is that really their wish? I doubt it. Most countries here would have been profoundly grateful

if the issue had never been raised at all and most, I suspect, would be deeply relieved if it were now to be permanently buried. For all our sakes, we should reflect seriously and dispassionately on what is at stake here this evening. It is, with respect, far more than the passage of a resolution of the General Assembly.

159. Mr. RAE (Canada): Canada's opposition to all forms of racial discrimination and our total commitment to and support for the Decade of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination remain as strong as ever. For over a quarter of a century, successive Canadian Governments have expressed their abhorrence for the policies of *apartheid* as practised in South Africa. We shall continue to condemn those policies, and we shall never relax our opposition to those degrading and oppressive laws.

160. It is for this reason that Canada voted in the Third Committee in favour of the draft resolution on the Decade for Action to Eliminate All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the draft resolution on the world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination to be held in Ghana in 1978.

161. However, at that time we were also presented with a draft resolution which attempts to define zionism as a form of racial discrimination, and the Canadian delegation said that it found the draft resolution then under consideration in the Committee, and now before us as draft resolution III, to be inappropriate, imprecise, contentious and unnecessary. Consequently, Canada voted against that draft resolution.

162. Unfortunately, the draft resolution was adopted by the Third Committee. We strongly believe that this draft resolution corrupts and distorts the goals of the Decade. It introduces an unacceptable element of an essentially unnecessary nature into the consideration of the Decade. After much thoughtful deliberation, and precisely because of the seriousness and depth of our support for the Decade, the Canadian Government has come to the firm conclusion that this draft resolution defining zionism as a form of racial discrimination is not only objectionable in itself but taints the two related draft resolutions on the Decade. Therefore, as long as this draft resolution stands, we are unable to support any of the three draft resolutions. Accordingly, Canada will vote "no" on the three draft resolutions, I, II and III.

163. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): In the Third Committee, my delegation supported the postponement of this question in order to allow us and many other delegations time to study the question of zionism. This was not an idle request or a political manoeuvre. My delegation cannot recall any time when the question of zionism has been studied in substance by the United Nations. It is true that we cannot blame others for our ignorance, but it is fair to confess it when it exists and it is also fair to ask for time to eliminate that ignorance. The English dictionary—which I have to use very much since English is not my mother tongue—defines "determination" *inter alia* as: "make up one's mind, decide, fix as known". My question therefore is, on what basis do I arrive at this proposed definition of zionism? What has been going on both inside the United Nations and outside is not helpful and confirms my ignorance. More important, the absence of an appropriate authoritative scholarly study before this

body on which to base the proposed definition of zionism raises serious difficulties. Indeed, apart from expressions of anger and sometimes insults or pleasure, depending upon the inclination of speakers, what has been going on sheds little or no light at all on the subject.

164. It is common practice for the Organization to request its organs to conduct studies and provide data on difficult issues on which the United Nations has been asked to take decisions. No adequate reasons have been given for rushing this definition through before some of us have had time to benefit from studies, both private and public.

165. For these reasons my delegation has no option but to abstain from voting either for or against this obviously over-simplified definition of zionism.

166. Baron VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Today we are faced with a challenge of most serious proportions and consequences. Draft resolution III, adopted by the Third Committee on 17 October, in its only operative paragraph "*Determines that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination*".

167. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and public opinion in my country are alarmed by the fact that such a draft resolution could have been approved by a Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations. If draft resolution III should be adopted by the Assembly, this would in our mind deal a severe blow to the spirit of co-operation which so far has prevailed in the Organization. The equation of zionism with racism and racial discrimination is devoid of any foundation and therefore unacceptable to us. At this delicate moment, such an equation will, furthermore, contribute to undermining prospects for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East by inciting emotions and increasing passions through the introduction of racist notions.

168. My Government's position in the Middle East conflict, in conformity with the position of the other members of EEC, is based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The position of the Nine was once again stated here this morning by the representative of Italy on behalf of the member States of EEC. In the opinion of my Government, a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East must respect Israel's right to live within secure and recognized boundaries; must recognize the right of the Palestinian people to express its national identity; and must include the termination of the territorial occupation Israel has maintained since 1967. However, our even-handed and constructive approach to the situation in the Middle East does not mean that we can accept draft resolutions such as the one equating zionism with racism and racial discrimination. Quite the contrary. By such an undertaking our attitude with regard to the situation in the Middle East is challenged in a most serious fashion. In other words, there do exist limits beyond which we cannot go, and these limits have been clearly overstepped here.

169. What makes the situation confronting us now even worse is the fact that in form as well as in substance a clear link has been established between draft resolution III on zionism and draft resolutions I and II concerning the Programme for the Decade for

Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The goals of the Programme for the Decade, which so far have enjoyed our full support, would be substantially altered and reorientated by the introduction of a new and extraneous element. If draft resolution III should be adopted, the main objectives of the Programme for the Decade, namely, the combat against racism and racial discrimination, will recede into the background and will be supplanted by a political struggle which has nothing to do with racism and racial discrimination. That would necessarily be at the expense of the goals agreed upon at the time of the adoption of the Programme for the Decade and it will undermine the solidarity which the world community has so far shown in the struggle against racial discrimination.

170. If the Assembly should decide to adopt draft resolution III on zionism, that would put the United Nations on a dangerous road. We shall not support a proposal which may well endanger prospects for future co-operation in the Organization. Draft resolution III is a challenge to reason, a challenge to the humanistic ideals that inspired the founders of the United Nations. This draft resolution in our mind deserves only one answer—a firm and categorical “no”.

171. At this moment we have not yet lost all hope that reason will finally prevail, in spite of all our difficulties. We appeal to all delegations and to their Governments to assist the United Nations in what should be its primary goal, to work together towards overcoming racism and racial discrimination in the world, and in particular in southern Africa, as well as towards a peaceful and just solution of the Middle East conflict. Otherwise, we have to announce that for the reasons given we shall have to vote against draft resolutions I, II and III.

172. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): The General Assembly will be called upon to express itself on several draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee in its report in document A/10320, all under the heading, “Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination”. My delegation expressed its opinion on these texts during the debate in the Third Committee—in some cases individually, in others through the representative of Italy as the country at present holding the presidency of EEC.

173. My delegation wishes to express its position unambiguously with regard to the most important draft resolutions contained in the report of the Third Committee, namely, draft resolutions I, II and III.

174. During the discussion in the Third Committee it became clear in a statement on behalf of the sponsors that the draft resolution now numbered III was introduced in connexion with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Draft resolutions I, II and III are, therefore, inextricably linked. Our vote will of necessity reflect this.

175. Draft resolution III is reprehensible to my Government. Its single operative paragraph is tantamount to unwarranted distortion of the concept of racism. To attempt to equate zionism with racism is a falsification of history and an attack on the integrity and existence of a people. Introducing this element into the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and

Racial Discrimination is to change the essence of the Decade from a commonly shared ideal, an ideal to which the Netherlands Government fervently adheres, into a divisive, politically motivated campaign against a Member State of the United Nations.

176. My delegation is deeply concerned that the adoption of draft resolution III will undermine the moral authority of the United Nations, tarnish its image and thus seriously affect the very fundamentals of the Organization. As a result, our efforts here in the United Nations to seek solutions and to foster international co-operation will seriously suffer. Adoption of draft resolution III will therefore mean a great setback for the Organization. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution III.

177. As we must now assume that draft resolution III will be adopted by the Assembly, and thus that the link between the operative paragraph of draft resolution III and the contents of draft resolutions I and II is maintained, my delegation will also, with the deepest regret, have to vote against draft resolutions I and II.

178. Mr. HARRY (Australia): This is a serious occasion, a solemn occasion, but I shall be brief in explaining the votes we are about to cast.

179. As our representative in the Third Committee indicated in his intervention on this item,⁵ Australia places great importance on the work which the United Nations and its various organs are doing to combat the evils of racial discrimination. We also appreciate and welcome the work being done by individual Member States to translate the principles enunciated in the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*] into concrete practice, both at the national and at the international level. We consequently welcomed the designation of a Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, for we view the Programme for the Decade as an action-oriented programme to direct our common and determined efforts to eradicate discrimination on racial grounds whenever and wherever it may occur.

180. It is particularly regrettable, therefore, that this year a number of delegations have seen fit to put at risk the unanimity with which we have thus far approached this subject; they have risked the failure of the Decade by using this item for the promotion of political ends related to the Middle East. It is regrettable that when preparations for a world conference on racial discrimination have scarcely begun, some delegations are seeking to undermine and prejudice the success of that conference.

181. For this we believe will be the result if draft resolution III is adopted by the General Assembly. Asking the Assembly to determine that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination is to ask us to accept that our activities under the Programme for the Decade should be directed towards the elimination not only of racism and racial discrimination, but also of the religious and political aspirations summarized in the term “zionism”. My delegation cannot accept that proposal and regrets that the attachment of such a definition to the other two draft resolutions places us in a position of having to oppose the Programme for the Decade, whose original purpose and goals we have long supported.

182. There is already a precise and detailed definition of racial discrimination contained in Article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Australia has ratified the Convention, we are bound by it, and we have given legislative effect to it. We do not believe that the passage of draft resolution III in the Assembly—a resolution which contradicts the Convention—can in any way alter or affect that Convention.

183. The Australian Government is doing everything possible to ensure that our people accept non-discrimination not only as a legal duty, but as a moral responsibility. Moreover, we shall not shrink from deploring flagrant violations which are the genuine concern of the international community. We will not, however, join in efforts to equate zionism with racism, for that is a proposition which we cannot accept in any sense. In our view, the advocacy of such a definition is an incitement to anti-Semitism and a violation of the Convention.

184. The attempt of the sponsors of draft resolution III to make such an equation is, we believe, a distortion of fact, is unhelpful in the context of the search for a settlement in the Middle East, and raises the very real possibility that it will exacerbate religious animosities in a number of countries.

185. The Australian delegation will therefore oppose the draft resolution on zionism, and because we believe that that draft resolution distorts the essential aims and purposes of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, we regret that, unless it is withdrawn, we are placed in a position of also having to oppose draft resolutions I and II. In all conscience we can take no other course.

186. Mrs. MUTUKWA (Zambia): My delegation will speak at this stage very briefly to explain our vote before draft resolution III is put to the vote. The draft resolution requires the General Assembly to determine that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

187. My delegation will, regretfully, abstain on this draft resolution. As should be clear to all, the part of item 68 to which this draft resolution relates deals with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The adoption of the draft resolution would make the elimination of zionism one of the objectives of the Decade and its Programme.

188. It is our desire for the success of the Programme for the Decade that prevents us from supporting the present draft resolution. It is obvious to us that the introduction of the issue of zionism into the Programme for the Decade will adversely affect the outcome of the Decade. Resolutions relating to the Decade and its Programme have so far been adopted mostly by consensus. The proceedings in the Third Committee and, indeed, in this Hall this afternoon on the issue show us all that this consensus will not be maintained once the draft resolution is adopted. We believe that there should be universal participation in the Programme for the Decade to ensure widespread success in the fight against racism. Moves that may get in the way of universal support and participation cannot be welcomed.

189. Let me emphasize here that my delegation has taken this decision to abstain, albeit reluctantly,

mainly on the basis of the fact that the question of zionism is being linked to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. We want this Decade to succeed. We therefore cannot be party to any action by the Assembly which could have the effect of defeating the very purpose of the Decade.

190. In this regard, we regret the fact that the draft resolution on zionism has been introduced by our friends with whom we have for many years been partners in the struggle against racial discrimination and racism. If the question of zionism had been brought up under a different and much more proper heading, the vote of my delegation might have been different. But, as matters are now, we believe that neither the cause of the Decade nor anti-zionism will be served: both may lose. This cannot but be a pity.

191. It is obvious that there would have been more votes both for the Decade and for the question of zionism had they not been lumped together. More important, the chances of their impact internationally would have been greater.

192. Our decision not to support the draft resolution is predicated on the understanding that the issue here is not whether or not to support zionism. The stand of my delegation on this issue is very clear and remains unchanged. My country broke off diplomatic relations with Israel because of our sympathy and support for the cause of our Arab brothers. We still condemn the expansionist policies of Israel and the racial overtones of its activities in the occupied Arab territories.

193. Zambia is strongly opposed to all forms of racism and racial discrimination wherever they exist and fervently hopes that this Decade will mark the end of that evil. We condemn racism in southern Africa, in the Middle East and in any part of the world in which it is to be found. My country is dedicated to the total success of the Decade and does not therefore welcome anything that would detract from this.

194. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to place on record quite clearly our opposition to draft resolution III, which refers to zionism and introduces a political element totally alien to the Decade, including definitions which should be rejected because they are groundless.

195. Even partisan fervor cannot justify these excesses, which will not stand up to the slightest historical or intellectual analysis. To equate zionism with racism would be tantamount not only to diverting us from the item before us but also to confusing two entirely different concepts. In my delegation's view, this type of draft resolution only serves to increase hostility in an area of the world in which a just and durable peace must be sought by peaceful means.

196. Therefore, the delegation of Uruguay reiterates here the negative vote it cast when this draft resolution was considered in the Third Committee. However, Uruguay is still determined to co-operate resolutely in the elimination of racial segregation or discrimination in all its forms.

197. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): The Government and the people of Ireland have associated themselves unreservedly with the necessity for the elimination of

racism and all forms of racial discrimination in accordance with the International Convention on the subject, of which we are signatories.

198. In this connexion I should like to quote from article 1 of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination the principles which should guide us in this debate:

“Discrimination between human beings on the ground of race, colour or ethnic origin is an offence to human dignity and shall be condemned as a denial of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations and as a fact capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples.” [Resolution 1904 (XVIII).]

The Government and people of Ireland give their whole-hearted support to the principle I have just quoted.

199. In particular, we are at one with other Member States of the United Nations in total rejection and abhorrence of racial discrimination practised as official policy, as in the case of the odious system of *apartheid* in South Africa. It is the people of southern Africa who are victims of the most virulent forms of racism and whose situation demands priority attention from the United Nations.

200. The attitude of my delegation to the situation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia reflects the concern of the Irish people for the victims of racism. The same concern is reflected in the fact that we uphold the Olympic principle in sport. We contribute to humanitarian aid for the victims of racialism in South Africa through the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa as well as the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. It is significant that the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa held its 1975 meeting in Dublin at the invitation of its Irish branch and in association with the Irish anti-*apartheid* movement.

201. I should like in this regard to refer to the remarks just made by the representative of Kuwait. My country does not have diplomatic relations with South Africa; our official contacts with that country are minimal. Furthermore, my Government has supported and observed the arms embargo against South Africa and has urged other countries to do likewise. As we have stated frequently, most recently in the debate on *apartheid* in the Special Political Committee, my Government believes in the maintenance of contacts on an individual basis primarily as a means by which the views of the world community can be borne in on the Government and the ruling white minority community.

202. Now to say this is not to imply that our efforts for the elimination of racial discrimination should be confined to southern Africa. More subtle but no less reprehensible forms of this evil phenomenon are found elsewhere, sometimes connected with problems of national minorities. We oppose such manifestations with equal firmness.

203. When, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights, the General Assembly proclaimed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination with the stated objective of achieving during the Decade the elimination as completely as possible of all discrimination based on race, colour, or national or ethnic descent or origin throughout the world, my delegation welcomed this step. We viewed the programme for the Decade as an opportunity for the furtherance in practice of the tenet that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

204. It follows from what I have said that only the most grave and fundamental considerations could lead my delegation to vote against draft resolutions of the nature of those on the implementation of the Programme for the Decade of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and on the world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination, namely, resolutions I and II.

205. We voted in favour of draft resolutions I and II in the Third Committee, but the Irish delegation would have wished that the Assembly could have an opportunity to vote first on draft resolution III, so that it could have approached the vote in the knowledge of the full implications of support for draft resolutions I and II. We deplore the decision not to permit that. In those circumstances, my delegation has no option but to approach the vote on I and II in the knowledge that III will, in all probability, be adopted.

206. Our objections to this last draft resolution, which we share with all our partners in EEC, were explained in the Third Committee by the representative of Italy in his capacity as representative of the country that is the current President of the Community.⁴ I will not repeat the statements already made on behalf of my delegation in the Third Committee, but I shall simply repeat the central fact that we reject the statement of the operative paragraph determining that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination as a false judgement.

207. Since the formulation of draft resolution III would determine zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination, this would place zionism unequivocally within the terms of reference of the Decade and the conference. It follows that the other draft resolutions will be equally unacceptable if draft resolution III is adopted.

208. The adoption of these draft resolutions will mark a departure from the spirit of common purpose which has characterized the United Nations struggle against *apartheid* and racism, and will introduce a divisive element that will seriously affect the cohesion of the United Nations in combating these evils.

209. In particular, the present position jeopardizes the effectiveness of the Decade and the success of the world conference and will make it difficult for many countries, including my own, to continue their support of the worthy and important objectives of the Decade and its Programme; nor will the draft resolutions, if all three are adopted, prove helpful in efforts to find, through negotiation, a just and peaceful solution to the problem of the Middle East.

210. Furthermore, while we recognize that it may not have been the intention of the sponsors, draft resolution III comes dangerously close to encouraging the very evil that the Decade is designed to combat.

It will certainly be so construed in many Member States. To that extent, the adoption of the three draft resolutions taken together will prove detrimental to that universal support and commitment which the United Nations needs to function effectively as a world organization.

211. My delegation feels that if all three draft resolutions are adopted today, the effectiveness of the Organization will be reduced. We cannot but mark our strong feelings on this point by a negative vote on draft resolutions which may have this consequence.

212. My delegation would at this stage make a final appeal to the Assembly to vote against draft resolution III in order to avert the consequences for the future of the Organization which its adoption will entail.

213. Should draft resolution III not be adopted, my delegation would be glad to support a motion under rule 81 for a reconsideration of this item, in order to be able to vote in favour of draft resolutions I and II on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and also for the conference in Ghana, as it would, of course, normally so strongly have wished to do.

214. Mr. SIKIVOU (Fiji): My delegation did not participate in the debate in the Third Committee when the subject of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination was being discussed, and I should now like briefly to explain our vote on the draft resolutions before us.

215. Draft resolutions I, II, IV and V have our full support. Resolution III, however, is one we have had difficulty with and which we will now oppose. We have decided to oppose it because it introduces a new element—the element of zionism—into the objectives of the Decade to combat racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* to which we at the United Nations are pledged to turn our undivided attention and efforts. Whereas this subject has enjoyed strong and undivided support in the past, as exemplified by the consensus reached in the Economic and Social Council on the implementation of the proposals on the Programme and the world conference, the zionism element has divided our ranks. It has dampened our enthusiasm; it has weakened our determination and has diluted our efforts to help the victims of racial discrimination and *apartheid*, who hopefully and rightly look to this Organization for concerted and united action to help to end their plight. We fail to see why we should be asked to single out zionism for stigmatization. We regard zionism as a nationalist movement of the Jewish people. We will not attempt to define zionism; it has been very ably defined by the representative of Israel.

216. There have been, and there are, expressions of nationalism the world over. The history of Europe, Asia and Africa, for example, is full of valiant and glorious accounts of peoples' nationalism moving them to the attainment of their nationhood and independence. Why we should single out zionism for branding as a form of racial discrimination is incomprehensible to my delegation. One has only got to look around this Hall—if one needs reminding—to recognize that the nationhood of many of us was achieved after the expression of our nationalism: in the case of some, for long and painful periods, over hard and

difficult roads. As far as Israel is concerned, zionism inspired its people—a people persecuted throughout history in several countries—to achieve nationhood and to establish, at long last, a national home for itself in the land of the Bible and of its ancestors.

217. I wish now to touch briefly on racial discrimination itself. How many representatives present here can truthfully say that racial discrimination, or tribal discrimination for that matter, is not practised in their countries? I suggest that the sponsors of the draft resolution may find some racial discrimination also, for example, in their respective countries' immigration laws and aid programmes, the allocation of job opportunities and job levels. A close examination of the practices and principles obtaining in our respective countries would, I suggest, reveal that most, if not all, of them have racial discrimination practised in some form or other. The only place I can think of that would be free from racial discrimination is the Kingdom of Heaven. All of us practise it in various forms and shades, with South Africa as by far the worst and most extreme. Its Government, its business and its society as a whole are riddled with it. That is why we must attend to racial discrimination as it exists in South Africa and not weaken our efforts by linking our endeavours with zionism.

218. I have outlined the reasons why my delegation opposes draft resolution III. We think that the people who want to oppose zionism should do so, if they must, in other areas and not in an area that we have allocated for the clear struggle against racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* as practised in South Africa. We shall therefore oppose the draft resolution that links zionism with racism and racial discrimination, and appeal to all who support nationalist movements everywhere and all who do not want our efforts against racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* watered down—in fact, we appeal to all fair-minded people who know that zionism is not a form of racial discrimination—to vote against the draft resolution also.

219. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation very much regrets that the proposal for postponement made by the representative of Belgium was not adopted and that a situation which we did our utmost to prevent has now come about.

220. Before the vote is taken I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the texts which have been submitted for adoption. I shall not repeat the explanation, of an essentially technical and legal nature, which the French delegation made in the Third Committee. That explanation remains valid and appears in the records of that Committee. That is particularly true of our comments on the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. My country has not, for legal reasons, acceded to that Convention and the explanation for that is to be found in the summary records of the Third Committee meetings.⁶ To be consistent, we shall abstain on draft resolution IV. Of course we shall vote in favour of draft resolution V, on the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The French delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions I and II only to the extent that there is no risk that the Decade for Action

to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination is diverted from its purposes. It will do so not without apprehension, however, and in a frame of mind quite different from its approach in past years, because of the disruptive element which has been introduced into the Decade by the draft resolution on zionism.

221. The French delegation fully supports the statements made on behalf of the nine countries of EEC on 3 and 16 October last by their spokesman.⁴ Not only do we find draft resolution III untimely and unacceptable, but if adopted it will also certainly have a direct or indirect impact on the Decade.

222. I hope that my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolutions I and II will be clearly understood. The purpose of those drafts is to put into effect a programme of action which the delegation of France fully supports. It goes without saying that words do have meanings for us, and when the United Nations reaffirms its intention to combat racism, that to us implies a number of specific matters, among which there is no question of including zionism. If, owing to some aberration, the programme of action we have approved should be wrongly implemented by improperly equating zionism with racism, the French delegation would be compelled to express its dissent and reconsider its position. On the draft resolution relating to zionism, my delegation will cast a categorical and definitive negative vote. It will not let itself be misled by confused terms or confused thought nor be drawn into an insignificant game of words, and it hopes that many other delegations will take the same responsible stand. It believes that the initiative which has been taken is particularly inappropriate, since it is directed against those who were not so very long ago the victims of the most odious form of racism.

223. I wish to reaffirm that France shares with those who have suffered the most from this scourge the legitimate desire to eliminate and uproot racism. One cannot but regret, however, that the United Nations is being obstructed by inappropriate actions as it tries to do its utmost to combat that evil. Regrettably, it is clear that the adoption of draft resolution III would weaken the Organization's fight against *apartheid* and racial discrimination, by diverting attention, dispersing efforts and weakening the will to participate. The success of the proposed world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination to be held at Accra in 1978, which is to be the central manifestation of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, has now been seriously jeopardized because many defections are now to be expected.

224. Generally speaking, the adoption of the draft resolution would raise doubts about the impartiality of the United Nations, and that would diminish the moral authority which the Organization enjoys all over the world. Within the Organization it would be a needless and dangerous source of division, as already shown by the acrimonious debate in the Third Committee, where the draft resolution was adopted by less than half the members.

225. There is also a particularly unfortunate additional factor: this draft resolution, which is quite out of order, can only have an adverse effect on efforts to bring about a just and peaceful settlement in the Middle East by means of negotiation. It is not yet too late. I therefore appeal to all delegations to give further

thought to the implications of the choice being forced on them, to refuse to become involved in a process which may be dangerous for the future of the Organization.

226. In the event that the Assembly adopts draft resolution III, I must say here that my delegation will immediately have its vote on resolutions I and II corrected from a vote in favour to an abstention, in order to convey the many reservations we should then have to the entire programme of the Decade.

227. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The explanation of vote before the vote of my delegation will be very brief and to the point. My Government totally and utterly rejects the idea that zionism is a form of racism. I think I can say, without running the risk of being contradicted, that Sweden has always been found in the forefront of the fight against racism, within the United Nations and elsewhere. We have actively supported all measures aimed at combating it.

228. We would have been happy to vote for draft resolutions I and II today also. However, I want to make it quite clear before the vote is taken on the three draft resolutions that, in view of the vote taken in the Third Committee on draft resolution III, and after the earlier votes taken here today, my delegation will vote against not only draft resolution III but also against draft resolutions I and II. We do so with the greatest regret, but we have been given no choice. As a consequence, we shall also be unable to vote for any funds for the world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination.

229. Mr. VINCI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to explain the position of the Italian delegation on the draft resolutions before this Assembly. I will begin by saying that we truly regretted the result of the votes on Belgium's proposals, a motion to defer the consideration of draft resolution III on zionism and a motion to reverse the order of voting so that draft resolution III would be voted on before draft resolutions I and II. We regret that these proposals were not adopted. My delegation would very much have liked these proposals to be adopted and, consequently, to have been spared the prejudice to the position that Italy will take both on the draft resolutions and on the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

230. We associated ourselves with the statements made on 3 and 16 October, on behalf of the nine members of EEC, in the Third Committee.⁴ We regretted then, and in future we shall regret even more, the adoption of draft resolution III, to which we remain totally opposed. The reasons why we have no choice but to vote here against draft resolutions I and II have already been given in the two statements on behalf of the nine members of EEC to which I have already referred. Therefore, I shall not repeat myself or give a lengthy explanation of vote; I would simply like to say that we have repeatedly warned the members of the Assembly of the effect the adoption of this draft resolution would have on the support of my country, and others, for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and of the various negative consequences that it would entail.

231. These statements which I am duty bound to make in no way affect the determination of my country

to continue the fight against racism in all its forms, and the latest proof of this was given by my Parliament in ratifying Italy's signature of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. I hope that in a few weeks I shall be able to deposit the instrument of ratification. I strongly believe, however, that this resolution will be a step backward in the history of our Organization and will constitute a serious threat to international co-operation through the United Nations system. We will unfortunately be obliged, against our will and desire, to draw the necessary inferences.

232. Having, I believe, clearly explained the reasons why we shall vote as I have indicated, I should like to say, by way of reply to any interpretations that may be placed on our stand, beginning with the representative of Kuwait, that we shall consider carefully all the proposals made within the framework of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. If we become convinced that a given proposal is in keeping with the struggle against *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination as viewed before today and as we understand them, without any intermixture or confusion with other tenets which we consider politically ill-founded, my country will not fail to support such a proposal.

233. Mr. ARNALLO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning, during the voting on the question of Palestine, the delegation of Chile expressed the wish that the steps taken by the United Nations in this tragic conflict should be conducive to co-operation in the cause of peace and justice in that region. We pointed out the essential principles through which this peace and justice could be attained—the right to self-determination and national sovereignty of the Palestinian people, the return of the occupied territories, and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of every State in the region, a region whose peoples, all of them, have been the disseminators of culture, progress and creative exchanges between men throughout the millennia of our history.

234. The long conflict persisting in that region calls for very special consideration and prudence. So far as the Chilean delegation is concerned, draft resolution III is so crucial that it should be approached with complete objectivity and with the desire to co-operate in the search for a peaceful and just solution. In that spirit, Chile decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

235. There were two main reasons. The fight against racism and racial discrimination is one of the most important activities of the United Nations, and should rally the efforts and support of all States.

236. This draft resolution claims to determine and denounce a form of racism, but paradoxically, because of its interpretation and its very importance, it could result in many parts of the world in actions that could rouse odious racial hatred and result in persecution of the Jews, actions which Chile rejects categorically, yet which present an inescapable danger which should be brought to the Assembly's attention. This first reason, then, is in keeping with the lofty principle in the Declaration of Principles of the Government of Chile which rejects racism in all its forms, including, of course, anti-Semitism.

237. The second main reason is that at this time, and in the political climate now prevailing, this draft resolution, rather than contributing to the achievement of the aims essential to the peace of the region, will serve to harden opposed positions and could result in the failure of the difficult negotiations aimed at attaining peace. If the priority is peace, there is no virtue in introducing a new element of conflict and passion, of further extending and confusing the issue. Chile hopes that the restoration of peace and the full recognition of the rights of all the peoples of the Middle East will be the most effective means to put an end to or prevent any form of racism and racial discrimination in the region.

238. It is for these reasons and in this spirit that the delegation of Chile will abstain during this impassioned voting.

239. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): On many occasions, both in the General Assembly and elsewhere, Iran has reaffirmed its traditional and unswerving policy of condemning all forms of racism and combating all forms of racial discrimination. Our position in this respect is so well known that it is not necessary for me to explain it here. I will simply say that we fully supported General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. We are determined to continue to give our full support to that programme, and to contribute, to the best of our means, to the common fight for the complete elimination of racism and racial discrimination throughout the world.

240. It is obvious, however, that draft resolution III adds a new element to the traditional framework of the fight against racism. The very basis of the element is vague, because the term "zionism" may be interpreted in many different ways and is not very clear to us in the context of this draft resolution. If we, nevertheless, voted in favour of that draft resolution in the Third Committee, and if we are voting today in the same way, it is out of a spirit of solidarity with our Arab brothers.

241. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait): Before I comment on my delegation's vote on the draft resolution recommended to the Assembly by the Third Committee, I should like to request, since I have the floor, that the vote on draft resolution III be taken by roll call.

242. I should also like to take this opportunity to invite the attention of the representative of Ireland to a document prepared by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*⁷ which contains a table under the heading "Diplomatic and other official relations of South Africa with States Members of the United Nations". In that table, the name of Ireland appears in both columns: among those countries which have official missions in South Africa—and it is indicated there that there is a consular mission or missions for Ireland in South Africa—and those countries where South Africa maintains missions, and there it is also indicated that South Africa has commercial and technical offices or officers in Ireland. If the representative of Ireland has any quarrel with these facts, I suggest that he refer to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, on the basis of whose information my delegation made the remark earlier today.

243. We shall vote proudly and strongly in favour of the recommended draft resolution III. We shall vote on that draft resolution in that manner on the basis, first, of our knowledge of what the authoritative United Nations definition of racism and racial discrimination is, and secondly, on the basis of our knowledge of what the Zionists' official definition of zionism is; and by comparing the authoritative and official United Nations definition of racism with the official Zionist definition of zionism, we conclude—as I am certain every delegation that took the trouble to view the matter without political, extraneous elements entering into the picture, would also conclude—that zionism is a form of racism and of racial discrimination.

244. The United Nations definition of racism and racial discrimination is contained in the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [resolution 1904 (XVIII)], article 1 of which states that:

“Discrimination between human beings on the ground of race, colour or ethnic origin is an offence to human dignity and shall be condemned . . .”

and in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [resolution 2106 (XX)], which goes even further, by stating in article 1 that:

“In this Convention, the term ‘racial discrimination’ shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin . . .”

245. We accept no abridgement of this definition. Racial discrimination is not only discrimination based on race in the biological, genetic sense of the term. Racial discrimination, the United Nations maintains, is not only the discrimination that is based on colour; racial discrimination is also discrimination that is based on descent, on national origin or on ethnic origin. This is the definition of racial discrimination less than which we shall not accept, because this is already the approved, formal, authoritative definition by the United Nations. Remarks to the effect that zionism does not involve discrimination on the basis of colour begin from an abbreviated and abridged definition of racism, instead of beginning from the total definition of racism adopted and espoused by the United Nations.

246. As for zionism, with all due respect to those who try to inject elements of semantic acrobatics into the debate, the zionism that this draft resolution speaks about is a concrete political ideology, articulated by a concrete political organization which launched a concrete political movement at a precise moment in time, which created concrete political institutions, and which manifested itself in concrete practices which had the effect of excluding some people on the basis of their being non-Jews and including others on the basis of their being Jews—Jewishness being defined officially by zionism as an ethnic and not strictly a religious definition.

247. My delegation presented the documentation supporting every word I have just now said in the Third Committee, and I defer to the urgency of our meeting and to the time of the representatives and shall not take the time of this meeting to re-read into the record once again the statements made by the

founder and father of the zionist movement and reiterated and carried forward until the present day in Israel as a continuation of the idea that Jewishness and the Jewish bond are not only, and not even primarily, a religious bond, but rather the membership in the ethnic community of Jewry, and that it is that which makes a person a Jew or excludes him from being a Jew.

248. The essence of the political doctrine of zionism is the concept that the Jews are one people, and the corollary that Jews must have a *Judenstaat*, a State of the Jews, of their own; and the programme of zionism in fulfilment of that objective was the dual programme of the ingathering of Jews, ethnically defined, from wherever they might be throughout the world, into one area, and the displacement of as many as possible of the non-Jews of that area in order to make room for the imported Jews. As in the beating of the heart two inextricable rhythmic operations—a pumping-in and a pumping-out operation—are indispensable for the heartbeat, so in the heartbeat of zionism the pumping-in of Jews and the pumping-out of non-Jews are indispensable for the fulfilment of the goal of the *Judenstaat*.

249. A country in which there is a law called the Law of Return, permitting a Jew who has never been to Palestine to “return”, and a policy prohibiting a Palestinian from actually returning to his home, both on the basis that the first is a Jew and the second is a non-Jew—how can a country like that be described as a democracy, and how can the label of racism and racial discrimination be questioned in application to that particular country?

250. The non-Jew who has not been pumped out—or not yet pumped out—of the *Judenstaat* suffers disabilities, *de facto* inequalities which, if suffered by Jews in any other country, the Zionists would be the first to call anti-Semitism. But when the Jew, in the name of Zionism and in the name of the *Judenstaat*, inflicts that same disability, that same inequality on the non-Jew, we are told that this is not racism, this is not racial discrimination.

251. By virtue of what principle of consistency can we say that a practice against a Jew by a non-Jew is racism and the same practice against a non-Jew by a Jew is not racism?

252. Those who spoke about the dignity of the United Nations and the integrity of the United Nations—let them recall that dignity and integrity rest in the first instance on consistency and on truthfulness, and not on twisting the truth to suit one's prejudices and one's biases with respect to who is affected here and who is affected there.

253. Zionism now makes a unilateral proclamation, saying that zionism is synonymous with Judaism and therefore opposition to zionism is synonymous with opposition to Judaism—that is, it is anti-Semitism.

254. Let me recall that the first objections and opposition to the doctrines of zionism, to the objective of zionism, to the programme of zionism, were aired by Jews, prominent Jewish intellectuals, prominent Jewish thinkers and prominent Jewish organizations. Long before zionism had become a world phenomenon, it was within the Jewish community, within Jewry, that the claim of zionism to be coextensive

with Jewry and the claim of zionism to be coextensive with and identical to Judaism were challenged. And to this day, while many Jews support Israel, those who are enrolled in the Zionist organization and consider themselves card-carrying active Zionists are an infinitesimal minority of Jews. Even in this country, where the Zionist organization is as strong as it is anywhere else, and perhaps much stronger than it is in many other countries, even here the membership of the Zionist organization is a minority membership within the large body of American Jews.

255. We too reject the claim by zionism that zionism is synonymous with Judaism. We in the Arab world, be we Christian Arabs or Muslim Arabs or Jewish Arabs, have nothing but reverence for Judaism as a faith, Judaism as a religion, Judaism as a tradition of religious and spiritual values. We revere Judaism as Christians, whose Christ proclaimed that He came to fulfil and not to destroy. We revere Judaism as Muslims, whose faith teaches us respect and veneration for all the prophets of Judaism. We reject the claim of zionism to be coextensive with Judaism. We reject the claim of zionism to be coextensive with the Jewish people. And therefore we reject the claim of zionism that to be anti-Zionist is to be anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic.

256. There is no "ism" in the world that has not been fair game for criticism. Capitalism, socialism, communism, any "ism" you can think of has been fair game for criticism. But there is one "ism" that comes to this platform to proclaim: "Hands off! If you criticize me, you are criticizing a religion. If you criticize me, you are expressing hatred for a people". I say that if this thesis were to be accepted, that would be tantamount to throwing a cloak of immunity over zionism, singling it out from all the other "isms" in the world as the only "ism" that cannot be criticized without one being assailed, without one being insolently railed against, without one being called anti-Semitic and a hater of the Jews.

257. This is discrimination: to discriminate in favour of one "ism" against all other "isms". Is criticism of nazism a criticism of the German people and of Christianity? Why should criticism of zionism automatically be considered criticism of Judaism and of the Jewish people?

258. We are all only too familiar with the abuse and exploitation of this argument by zionism to silence all its critics, to intimidate its critics and also to draw solidarity and sympathy to itself from Jews who had otherwise not shown much sympathy for zionism. We know that in many instances zionism has been the chief exploiter of anti-Semitism, real or alleged, and therefore zionism has been the first to proclaim that any criticism of zionism is a form of anti-Semitism, in furtherance of the same principle that has animated all its activities.

259. We shall not be intimidated. We are against zionism as a form of racism. We are against anti-Semitism, and we reject the equation of anti-zionism with anti-Semitism. We revere the Jewish faith. We in the Arab world showed hospitality to Jews who came fleeing from persecution in Europe when European anti-Semitism was driving them into our arms; we permitted them to come and share our lives and share our limited resources and have as much freedom

as we ourselves had, because we were receiving them as human beings. It was only when the Zionists came, and instead of the Jews, saying, "I should like to live with you", the Zionists came, saying "I want to live in your place". It was only when the Zionists came that our hospitality to the Jew turned into hostility to the Zionist, but we reject the contention that the hostility to the Zionist indicates any lessening of the hospitality to the Jew, the human being, who is not animated by the racism and exclusionism of zionism.

260. We have also been told that zionism is a national liberation movement. In fact, this claim was first voiced in 1968 by the 28th World Zionist Congress. It took zionism 71 years to discover its purported identity. When zionism started, it called itself colonialism. Herzl wrote to none other than Cecil Rhodes. I would refer members to volume 4 of his *Diaries*,⁸ page 1193 onwards. He said,

"Please make a statement that you have examined my programme and found it appropriate. Why do I come to you, Mr. Rhodes, you will ask: because my programme is a colonial programme."

At that time colonialism was in vogue. Zionism had no difficulty in recognizing its true identity as a colonial movement. It called its first bank the Colonial Trust Company. It called its department of settlement the Department of Colonization. It called its settlements colonies. It likened itself to the *conquistadores*. It likened itself to the French *colons* in North Africa. This was the literature of zionism. This was recognition by zionism of its colonial nature.

261. But now, in the 1970s, with national liberation movements the vogue of the day, zionism also wants to jump on the bandwagon and call itself a liberation movement. It tried it with Gandhi, and Gandhi said no. It wanted to get from him a recognition that it was a legitimate national movement. He said, "You are an alien body in the Middle East".

262. The liberation movements know themselves. There is no national liberation movement in existence today that does not feel fraternal bonds with the PLO or condemn zionism as a racist and colonial movement.

263. An authentic national liberation movement views its salvation through its liberation, but not through the enslavement of others. No movement that views its salvation through the enslavement of others can be a true liberation movement. No movement that seeks its ingathering through the dispersal of others can be a true national liberation movement. Zionism may try to jump on the bandwagon, but those on the bandwagon will push it away. Zionism cannot be accepted by the ranks of national liberation movements as a national liberation movement.

264. I appeal to all delegations that have already announced that they will oppose draft resolution III. I appeal to them in the name of consistency and in the name of truth. I say to them it is not yet too late. If they truly abhor racism, if truly they are for the truth and for consistency, then, despite their announcement, let them vote for recommendation III and save the United Nations. Save the integrity of the United Nations; save the United Nations from being accused of being an organization that would call a spade a spade in

South Africa but would hesitate to call the same spade a spade in South-West Asia.

265. Mr. KARHILO (Finland): My Government's firm rejection of racial discrimination has been reaffirmed at all stages of our discussion of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Thus, our support for the activities of the Decade has reflected our strong condemnation of racism and racial discrimination as defined in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

266. When the General Assembly, by its resolution 3057 (XXVIII) which was adopted by consensus, inaugurated the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and approved the Programme for the Decade, the concept of racial discrimination was understood in the way it was defined in the Convention. It was on that understanding that States undertook to participate in the observance of the Decade by intensifying and expanding their efforts towards ensuring the rapid eradication of racism and racial discrimination. The implementation of national programmes adopted for that purpose in various countries, including my own, has already started.

267. My Government considers that the objectives of the Convention should not be changed by a vote of the General Assembly. If this happened, it would destroy and annul resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and consequently release States from the obligations they assumed by adopting the Programme for the Decade, thus jeopardizing the achievement of the true purpose of the Decade.

268. For reasons already explained in the Third Committee,⁹ my delegation will, consistently, have to vote against draft resolution III in the plenary Assembly. We deeply regret that because of the serious implications for the Programme for the Decade of the operative paragraph of draft resolution III on zionism, we shall be compelled also to oppose the two draft resolutions concerning the activities of the Decade.

269. Mr. HJORTH-NIELSEN (Denmark): It is with great regret that Denmark will feel compelled to vote against draft resolutions I and II dealing with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the proposed world conference on this matter. It is with great regret—I repeat, with great regret—that we do this, since there is no country in the Organization to which racism and racial discrimination is more repugnant than to Denmark. Therefore we would have wished to be able to continue to support the two texts, just as we voted for them in the Economic and Social Council. But the presentation of draft resolution III equating zionism with racism, the prospect of its adoption and the clear links existing between draft resolutions I, II and III has made it impossible.

270. Our objections are fundamental. We unconditionally reject this dangerous and fallacious concept of equating zionism with racism. Until the question of zionism has been effectively separated from the problem of racism, a cloud will continue to hang over the efforts of the Organization, and the struggle against racism, and public support in our countries will be eroded.

271. If, however, in the future a satisfactory solution is found, we shall be glad to re-examine our attitude to draft resolutions I and II. We sincerely hope, therefore, that better counsel will in time prevail so that we shall be able to resume our work in a more realistic and constructive atmosphere in the interests of the Organization and the countries involved.

272. In the meantime, we shall vote against draft resolutions I, II and III.

273. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): The Norwegian Government is firmly opposed to racism and racial discrimination. My Government has given its full political, moral and material support to those peoples which are in the forefront of the struggle against these evils, namely, the African peoples of southern Africa. Consistent with this policy, we were looking forward to active participation in the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, seeing the Decade as an instrument to highlight the degrading practice of racial discrimination and arouse the world's conscience.

274. It is totally unacceptable to my Government to equate zionism with racism. We reject the mere idea that zionism is any kind or any form of racism. The adoption of draft resolution III would thus prevent Norway from participating in the activities in connexion with the Decade. As the adoption of that draft resolution now seems to be a foregone conclusion, we deeply regret that we have no choice but to vote against draft resolutions I and II as well.

275. The positive contribution we had hoped to make towards the success of the Decade as envisaged at the time of the fifty-eighth session of the Economic and Social Council has been denied us by the introduction of the totally alien element of zionism in this context.

276. I feel it to be my responsibility too, to express deep concern about the harmful consequences which the adoption of draft resolution III will have for the future standing of the United Nations with the Norwegian people, which has been an ardent supporter of the United Nations from its very inception to this date. We are also concerned about the effects which the draft resolution, if adopted, might have on the future work of our Organization.

277. Mr. RETTEL (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): The vote which will shortly be taking place is certainly one of the most important that has been taken in recent years in the United Nations, not only because of the matters of substance which it raises but also because of the impact it might have on the work of the Organization and its effect on the relations that must be maintained among us and that should be marked by friendly co-operation, which can make possible the solution of even the most difficult problems.

278. While over the past few months real, though limited, progress has been made towards a peaceful settlement of the problem in the Middle East and while there is, if not a consensus, at least a generally shared conviction that a solution of the problem can be found not only in respect for the right to existence of all States in the area but also recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, and in particular its right to the expression of its national identity, the efforts over the past few weeks to intro-

duce into our debates a new element which is not only alien but divisive are frankly regrettable.

279. My country is and always has been very strongly opposed to all forms of racial and other discrimination. That is why we supported draft resolutions I and II on the Decade in the debate on the subject in the Third Committee. Unfortunately, the draft resolutions were watered down after the event by another draft resolution which seeks to decide that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. My delegation most definitely rejects the equation of the two concepts, which it considers to be false as to substance and extremely dangerous for the future of the United Nations. This draft resolution, if adopted, would considerably reduce the moral authority of the United Nations and its ability to promote a genuine international dialogue in the interests of international co-operation.

280. The obvious link between draft resolution III and draft resolution I on the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination leads us, very much to our regret, to say that we must vote against the latter, as well as against draft resolution II on the world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination. These ideas were put forward forcefully in the Third Committee by the representative of Italy on behalf of the nine EEC countries.⁴

281. As the delegation of a small country which in the recent past suffered from certain forms of discrimination, we fully support the appeal made a few minutes ago at this rostrum to all delegations to consider conscientiously their position on this question of crucial importance to the Organization.

282. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to confirm the total opposition of my delegation to draft resolution III, on which we are about to vote. The representative of Italy twice explained eloquently in the Third Committee on behalf of the nine members of EEC the reasons for this total opposition,⁴ and we fully endorse what he said.

283. Zionism is not a form of racial discrimination. The unfortunate development of this situation will compel us to vote against draft resolutions I and II as well. We shall do so with deep regret, having done everything possible in the Assembly to prevent things reaching this point.

284. Our African colleagues will understand, I hope, that our negative vote on draft resolution I in no way lessens Belgium's determination to struggle against racism in all its forms. I hope that our colleagues and friends from Ghana—a country with which we maintain the most cordial relations—will appreciate that our vote against draft resolution II, which my country warmly supported both in the Economic and Social Council and in the Third Committee, in no way signifies the slightest change for the worse in our excellent relations.

285. Mr. MORENO MARTÍNEZ (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of the Dominican Republic represents a multiracial national community where Dominicans of Arab and Jewish origin live together with Dominicans of all races and from all parts of the world, all of whom are

treated in the same way as Dominicans from the old Hispanic-African stock. We believe that we can be taken as an example of a racially integrated society, and we are justly proud of that.

286. For that reason the Dominican delegation fully agrees that it is necessary to combat racial discrimination wherever it exists. We are radically opposed to racism, and because we are, we will vote in favour of draft resolutions I and II in the hope that draft resolution III will be rejected. We believe it is wrong and unjust to consider that zionism is a form of racial discrimination. Draft resolution III not only is unjust and erroneous, it is also damaging. I believe we have all realized that for a long time now. It is damaging because it has destroyed the consensus which had been achieved to combat racial discrimination and because it introduces a new disruptive element in the already difficult conflict in the Middle East and makes it even more unlikely that a just and lasting peace will be brought about there.

287. The delegation of the Dominican Republic wishes to urge you to pause and ponder. We appeal particularly to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to use our numerical strength in the General Assembly to contribute to the maintenance of the consensus in favour of the fight against racial discrimination and to help the suffering peoples of the Middle East in their efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace.

288. I believe that all delegations that wish to see peace in the Middle East and put an end to racial discrimination must vote against the idea of including zionism among the forms of racial discrimination. Casting a vote against draft resolution III is to cast a vote in favour of peace in the Middle East and in favour of the fight against racial discrimination.

289. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Permit me to make a few very brief comments in order to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions I and II concerning the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and a world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination.

290. The comments on draft resolution III made by my delegation in the Third Committee¹⁰ have demonstrated our categorical rejection of the misguided ideas it contains.

291. As my delegation has already stated on several occasions, and especially in the debate we had on this topic in the Third Committee one month ago, Austria had placed high hopes in the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. My delegation was pleased, therefore, to note that the Economic and Social Council had achieved a consensus on the draft resolutions I am referring to. Furthermore, my delegation had found no difficulty in voting for those resolutions in the Third Committee. However, at that time my delegation had already pointed out that if the draft resolution equating zionism with racism and racial discrimination were adopted, it would be forced to reconsider its attitude towards draft resolutions I and II relating to the Decade.

292. That situation now seems to have arisen. It is with deep regret, therefore, that because of the adoption, apparently imminent, of that draft resolution,

my delegation feels forced to withdraw the support it had formerly given to the resolution on the Decade and transform its positive vote into an abstention.

293. That decision has been motivated by the delegation's firm belief that the introduction of elements unconnected with and, in our view, totally alien to the noble cause of eradicating racism and racial discrimination constitutes a tragic and meaningless aberration in our common effort, and can only have grave and disruptive effects on the Organization. This attempt clearly distorts the original purpose of the Decade and upsets the splendid record the Assembly and the Organization have achieved in their fight against real racism and real racial discrimination, a fight which my country has never failed to support.

294. Finally, it is not only because of compelling legal and political considerations, but also for profound moral reasons that Austria finds itself unable to be associated with such a course.

295. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now vote on draft resolution I, "Implementation of the Programme for the Decade of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report [A/10320]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the financial implications of draft resolution I is contained in document A/10336. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Malawi, New Zealand, Paraguay.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 117 votes to 19, with 5 abstentions (resolution 3377 (XXX)).

296. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now vote on draft resolution II, "World conference to combat racism and racial discrimination", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Central African Republic, Haiti, Malawi, New Zealand, Paraguay.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 116 votes to 18, with 7 abstentions (resolution 3378 (XXX)).

297. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution III, "Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, German Democratic Republic.

Against: Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of).

Abstaining: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritius, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Argentina, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 72 votes to 35, with 32 abstentions (resolution 3379 (XXX)).

298. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution IV, "Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 3380 (XXX)).

299. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution V, "Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 3381 (XXX)).

300. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

301. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): As I made most clear before the vote that has just taken place, my delegation wishes to correct its votes on resolutions I and II on racism and the Decade. I request that France be considered as having abstained from voting on both texts. Indeed, it is now clear that they are related to the text on Zionism.

302. As a matter of principle, my delegation respects freedom and the sense of responsibility of every delegation in this Assembly. Each of them should cast its vote in keeping with the spirit of justice, the spirit of moderation and the desire to serve the international conscience. France had hoped until the last minute that passions, partisanship and the taste for fleeting alliances would yield to reason. It had hoped that the majority of the Assembly would realize that there was a great need not to change or call into question the

consensus which had always prevailed here on such serious subjects as human dignity and the combat which we must wage against all forms of racism. But it cannot subscribe to the idea of equating Zionism and racism, as draft resolution III does. Much to our regret, we must enter a formal reservation as regards the general trend which the activities of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination runs the risk of following. That is the meaning of the correction of vote which I request be made.

303. It will be remembered that on this sorry day the United Nations divided itself into conflicting groups on the very nature of racism. It is our hope that the Organization will come to its senses and that the Decade we had agreed to organize will distance itself from topics which would make it an ideological battlefield.

304. France hopes that the correction of its vote will be interpreted as an appeal and as a solemn warning. It should be abundantly clear to everyone that France will, as a matter of principle and also in practice, oppose any action relating to the Decade that would divert it from the proper objective which we assign it.

305. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will take note of the statement by the representative of France.

306. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

307. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): There appears to have developed in the United Nations the practice for a number of countries to combine for the purpose of doing something outrageous, and thereafter, the outrageous thing having been done, to profess themselves outraged by those who have the temerity to point it out, and subsequently to declare themselves innocent of any wrong-doing in consequence of its having been brought about wholly in reaction to the "insufferable" acts of those who pointed the wrong-doing out in the first place.

308. Out of deference to these curious sensibilities, the United States chose not to speak in advance of this vote: we speak in its aftermath and in tones of the utmost concern.

309. The United States rises to declare before the General Assembly and before the world, that it does not acknowledge, it will not abide by, it will never acquiesce in this infamous act.

310. Not three weeks ago, the United States representative in the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee¹¹—and with what irony those terms ring on our ears today—pleaded in measured and fully considered terms for the United Nations not to do this thing. It was, he said, "obscene". It is something more today, for the furtiveness with which this obscenity first appeared among us has been replaced by a shameless openness.

311. There will be time enough to contemplate the harm this act will have done the United Nations. Historians will do that for us, and it is sufficient for the moment only to note one foreboding fact: a great evil has been loosed upon the world.

312. The abomination of anti-Semitism—as this year's Nobel Peace Laureate Andrei Sakharov ob-

served in Moscow just a few days ago—has been given the appearance of international sanction. The General Assembly today grants symbolic amnesty—and more—to the murderers of the 6 million European Jews. Evil enough in itself, but more ominous by far, is the realization that now presses upon us: the realization that if there were no General Assembly this could never have happened.

313. As this day will live in infamy, it behooves those who sought to avert it to declare their thoughts so that historians will know that we fought here, that we were not small in number—not this time—and that while we lost, we fought with full knowledge of what indeed would be lost.

314. Nor should any historian of the event, nor yet any who have participated in it, suppose that we have fought only as Governments, as chancelleries, and on an issue well removed from the concerns of our respective peoples. Others will speak for their nations as others have: I will speak for mine.

315. In all our postwar history there has not been another issue which has brought forth such unanimity of American public opinion. The President of the United States has from the first been explicit: this must not happen. The Congress of the United States, in a measure unanimously adopted in the Senate and sponsored by 436 of 437 Representatives in our House, declared its utter opposition. Following only American Jews themselves, the American trade union movement was first to the fore in denouncing this infamous undertaking. Next, one after another, the great private institutions of American life pronounced anathema on this evil thing—and most particularly, the Christian churches have done so. Reminded that the United Nations was born in the struggle against just such abominations as we are committing today—the wartime alliance of the United Nations dates from 1942—the United Nations Association of the United States has for the first time in its history appealed directly to each of the 141 other delegations in New York not to do this unspeakable thing.

316. The proposition to be sanctioned by a resolution of the General Assembly is that “Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination”. Now that is a lie, but it is a lie which the United Nations has now declared to be a truth, and so the actual truth must be restated.

317. The very first point to be made—and here I must respectfully take issue with my colleague from Kuwait, a man genuinely distinguished for his scholarship but who none the less on this matter is simply wrong—is that the United Nations has declared zionism to be racism without ever having defined racism: “Sentence first, verdict afterwards”, as the Queen of Hearts said. But this is not Wonderland. It is a real world where there are real consequences to folly and venality.

318. It was only on 7 November that the President of the General Assembly, speaking on behalf of Luxembourg, warned not only of the trouble which would follow from the adoption of this resolution but of its essential irresponsibility, for, he noted, Members have wholly different ideas as to what they are condemning. “It seems to me”, he said—and to his lasting honour, he said it when there was still time—“that

before a body like this takes a decision it should agree very clearly on what it is approving or condemning, and it takes more time.”

319. Lest I be unclear, the United Nations has, in fact, on several occasions defined “racial discrimination”. The definitions have been loose but recognizable. It is “racism”, incomparably the more serious charge—racial discrimination is a practice, racism is a doctrine—it is racism that has never been defined. Indeed, the term has only recently appeared in General Assembly documents.

320. The one occasion that we have been able to find on which we know it to have been discussed was the 1644th meeting of the Third Committee on 16 December 1968,¹² in connexion with the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. On that occasion—to give some feeling for the intellectual precision with which the matter was being treated—the question arose as to what should be the relative positioning of the terms “racism” and “nazism” in a number of preambular paragraphs. The distinguished representative of Tunisia argued that “racism” should go first because, he said, nazism was a form of racism. Not so, said the no less distinguished representative of the USSR, for, he explained, nazism contained all the main elements of racism within its ambit and should be mentioned first. That is to say that racism was merely a form of nazism. The discussion wound to its weary and inconclusive end, and we are left with nothing to guide us, for even that one discussion of “racism” confined itself to word orders in preambular paragraphs and did not at all touch on the meaning of the words as such.

321. Still, one cannot but ponder the situation we have made for ourselves in the context of the Soviet statement on that not-so-distant occasion. If, as the distinguished representative declared, racism is a form of nazism, and if, as this resolution declares, zionism is a form of racism, then we have step by step taken ourselves to the point of proclaiming—the United Nations is solemnly proclaiming—that zionism is a form of nazism.

322. What we have here is a lie, a political lie of a variety well known to the twentieth century and scarcely exceeded in all that annal of untruth and outrage. The lie is that zionism is a form of racism. The overwhelmingly clear truth is that it is not.

323. The word “racism” is a creation of the English language, and relatively new to it. It is not, for instance, to be found in the Oxford English dictionary. The term derives from relatively new doctrines, all of them discredited, concerning the human population of the world, to the effect that there are significant, biological differences among clearly identifiable groups, and that those differences establish in effect, different levels of humanity. Racism, as defined by Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, is, “the assumption that . . . traits and capacities are determined by biological race and that races differ decisively from one another”. It further involves “a belief in the inherent superiority of a particular race and its right to domination over others”.

324. That meaning is clear. It is equally clear that that assumption, that belief, has always been altogether alien to the political and religious movement known as Zionism. As a strictly political movement, Zionism was established only in 1897, although there is a clearly legitimate sense in which its origins are indeed ancient. For example, many branches of Christianity have always held that from the standpoint of the Biblical prophets Israel would be reborn one day. But the modern Zionist movement arose in Europe in the context of a general upsurge of national consciousness and aspiration that overtook most other peoples of Central and Eastern Europe after 1848 and that in time spread to all of Africa and Asia. It was to those persons of the Jewish religion a Jewish form of what today is called a national liberation movement. Probably a majority of those persons who became active Zionists and sought to emigrate to Palestine were born within the confines of Czarist Russia and it was only natural for Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to deplore, as he did in 1948 at the 299th meeting of the Security Council, the act by Israel's neighbours of "sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed"—in Mr. Gromyko's own words—"at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine".¹³

325. Now it was the singular nature—if I am not mistaken it was the unique nature—of that national liberation movement that, in contrast with the movements that preceded it, those of that time and those that have come since, it defined its members not in terms of birth but of belief. That is to say, it was not a movement of the Irish to free Ireland or of the Polish to free Poland; not a movement of Algerians to free Algeria or of Indians to free India.

Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Vice-President, took the Chair.

326. It was not a movement of persons connected by historical membership in a genetic pool of the kind that enables us to speak loosely but not meaninglessly of, say, the Chinese people, nor yet of diverse groups occupying the same territory which enables us to speak of the American people with no greater indignity to truth. To the contrary, Zionists defined themselves merely as Jews, and declared to be Jewish anyone born of a Jewish mother or—and this is the absolutely crucial fact—anyone who converted to Judaism. Which is to say, in the terms of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth session, anyone—regardless of "race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin . . ."

327. The State of Israel, which in time was created by the Zionist movement, has been extraordinary for nothing so much as the range of what I call sometimes "racial stocks" from which it has drawn its citizenry. There are black Jews, brown Jews, white Jews, Jews from the Orient and Jews from the West. Most such persons could be said to have been "born" Jews, just as most Presbyterians and most Hindus are "born" to their faith, but there are many Jews who are converts. And with a consistency in the matter which surely attests to the importance of this issue to that religious and political culture, Israeli courts have held that a Jew who converts to another religion

is no longer a Jew. In the meantime the population of Israel also includes large numbers of non-Jews, among them Arabs both of the Muslim and Christian religions and Christians of other national origins. Many of those persons are citizens of Israel, and those who are not can become citizens by legal procedures very much like those which obtain in a typical nation of Western Europe.

328. Now I wish it to be understood that I am here making one point, and one point only, which is that whatever else Zionism may be, it is not and cannot be "a form of racism". In logic, the State of Israel could be, or could become, many things, theoretically including many undesirable things, but it could not be and could not become racist unless it ceased to be Zionist.

329. Indeed, the idea that Jews are a "race" was invented not by Jews but by those who hated Jews. The idea of Jews as a race was invented by nineteenth century anti-Semites such as Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Edouard Drumont, who saw that in an increasingly secular age, which is to say an age which made for fewer distinctions between people based on religion, the old religious grounds for anti-Semitism were losing force. New justifications were needed for excluding and persecuting Jews, and so the idea of Jews as a race—rather than as adherents of a religion—was born. It was a contemptible idea at the beginning, and no civilized person would be associated with it. To think that it is an idea now endorsed by the United Nations is to reflect on what civilization has come to.

330. It is precisely concern for civilization, for civilized values that are or should be precious to all mankind, that arouses us at this moment to such special passion. What we have at stake here is not merely the honour and the legitimacy of the State of Israel—although a challenge to the legitimacy of any Member nation ought always to arouse the vigilance of all Members of the United Nations; a yet more important matter is at issue, which is the integrity of that whole body of moral and legal precepts which we know as human rights.

331. The terrible lie that has been told here today will have terrible consequences. Not only will people begin to say, as indeed they have already begun to say, that the United Nations is a place where lies are told but, far more serious, grave and perhaps irreparable harm will be done to the cause of human rights. The harm will arise first because it will strip from racism the precise and abhorrent meaning that it still precariously holds today. How will peoples of the world feel about racism, and about the need to struggle against it, when they are told that it is an idea so broad as to include the Jewish national liberation movement?

332. As this lie spreads, it will do harm in a second way. Many of the Members of the United Nations owe their independence in no small part to the notion of human rights, as it has spread from the domestic sphere to the international sphere and exercised its influence over the old colonial Powers. We are now coming into a time when that independence is likely to be threatened again. There will be new forces, some of them arising and visible now, new prophets and new despots, who will justify their actions with the help of just such distortions of words as we have

sanctioned here today. Today we have drained the word "racism" of its meaning. Tomorrow, terms like "national self-determination" and "national honour" will be perverted in the same way to serve the purposes of conquest and exploitation. And when these claims begin to be made, as they have already begun to be made, it is the small nations of the world whose integrity will suffer. And how will the small nations of the world defend themselves, and on what grounds will others be moved to defend and protect them, when the language of human rights, the only language by which the small can be defended, is no longer believed and no longer has a power of its own?

333. There is that danger, and then a final danger, which is the most serious of all. It is that the damage we now do to the idea of human rights and the language of human rights could well be irreversible. The idea of human rights as we know it today is not an idea which has always existed in human affairs. It is an idea which appeared at a specific time in the world, and under very special circumstances. It appeared when European philosophers of the seventeenth century began to argue that man was a being whose existence was independent from that of the State and that he need join a political community only if he did not lose by that association more than he gained. From this very specific political philosophy stemmed the idea of political rights, of claims that the individual could justly make against the State; it was because the individual was seen as so separate from the State that he could make legitimate demands upon it.

334. That was the philosophy from which the idea of domestic and international rights sprang. But most of the world does not hold with that philosophy now. Most of the world believes in newer modes of political thought, in philosophies that do not accept the individual as distinct from and prior to the State, in philosophies that therefore do not provide any justification for the idea of human rights and philosophies that have no words by which to explain their value. If we destroy the words that were given to us by past centuries, we will not have words to replace them, for philosophy today has no such words.

335. But there are those of us who have not forsaken those older words, still so new to much of the world. Not forsaken them now, not here, not anywhere, not ever.

336. The United States of America declares that it does not acknowledge, it will not abide by, it will never acquiesce in this infamous act.

337. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): The Brazilian Government voted in favour of the draft resolution which declares that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. The Brazilian vote is not and could not be interpreted in any way as against Jews or Judaism. Brazil fully recognizes the valuable contribution of those Jews who, born in our country or abroad, live within our community. The Brazilian people is wholly averse to racism owing to its own background and moral principles. Brazil repudiates racists and racist concepts. It would not be too much to remind the Assembly in this context that Brazilian soldiers sacrificed their lives in Europe in the struggle against Nazi fascism and its genocidal practices. In Brazil there is no legal, social or any other type of discrimination whatsoever against ethnic or religious

groups. In point of fact, Brazilians of Jewish faith or origin participate in all fields of activity in conditions of full equality with other Brazilians. It is thus totally uncalled for to accuse the Brazilian Government or society of any racist or discriminatory attitudes.

338. Brazil, however, does not have any commitment to Zionist doctrines. Brazil has recognized Israel as an independent State since its creation but does not admit that this recognition can be linked to the acceptance of Zionist deeds. This position is also valid in other cases. In fact, to recognize a sovereign State and entertain correct and even friendly diplomatic relations with it does not imply the acceptance of doctrines or ideologies that might have prompted or justified the historic facts that led to the creation of that State.

339. For political or religious reasons, not all members of the Jewish community have accepted Zionist ideas. Many repudiate them and do not lose for this reason their religious or ethnic condition as Jews. The alleged identification of anti-zionism with anti-Semitism thus cannot be accepted.

340. The Brazilian vote means that we do not support zionism as a racial or exclusivistic doctrine. Brazil does not wish to be led to acquire, contrary to its national traditions, any kind of racism, be it in sophisticated forms or by the simple ignoring of reality. All Brazilians have the same rights and duties. Brazilian society has shown an extraordinary capacity to absorb and integrate in conditions of equality population groups from all continents. In Brazil the phenomenon of separation or segregation of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities is non-existent. It would, therefore, be displeasing to Brazilian citizens to recognize that in their midst some might feel closer links to their race or to the country of their ancestors than to Brazil itself.

341. Finally, we do not believe the suggested parallel between the situation of Israel and colonial questions to be valid. The essence of the colonial problem is the aspiration of peoples to independence. The State of Israel was created nearly 30 years ago. Thus zionism, even if taken as a movement of national liberation, has run its historical course.

342. Mrs. OGATA (Japan): Ever since Japan proposed the inclusion of the principle of racial equality in the Covenant of the League of Nations more than 50 years ago we have remained strongly opposed to all forms of racial discrimination. My delegation has supported the United Nations efforts to carry out massive and concerted action against any systematic policies of racial discrimination, and has pronounced its readiness to co-operate in the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

343. My delegation believes that the United Nations, in setting goals for action, especially action against a specific form of human rights violation, cannot be too cautious lest emotion and political considerations of the time lead to further injustice to the generations to come. In the view of my delegation, the deliberations on draft resolution III required more time and greater effort to arrive at a consensus before we decided upon any expansion of the Programme for the Decade.

344. My delegation supported the proposal for the postponement of the adoption of draft resolution III as

we felt that no United Nations programme for action against human rights violations should be carried out without the convinced support of the overwhelming majority of the Member States. However, the adoption of draft resolution III has caused grave concern to our delegation. The linking of zionism to the objectives of the Decade has introduced an element that is too controversial and political to permit united action against racism and racial discrimination as originally conceived.

345. In the Programme for the Decade it is clearly stated that "discrimination between human beings on the ground of race, colour or ethnic origin is an affront to humanity and shall be condemned as a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations." [See resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex.] In fact, the Programme was designed primarily to eliminate *apartheid*, which is the most flagrant case of the institutionalized practice of discrimination based on racial origin. From the recent debate in the Third Committee, my delegation could not conclude that zionism fell into the same category of such a clear-cut discriminatory practice. My delegation therefore abstained on draft resolution III, which determines zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination. My delegation, however, voted for draft resolutions I and II, as we felt that we could not fail to support the objectives of the Decade as they were originally conceived. Our position with regard to the Programme for the Decade, including the establishment of an international fund and the convening of the world conference, will be reviewed on the basis of how the Decade in fact develops. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Programme for the Decade will be carried out in a direction that will gain wide support, and that the adoption of draft resolution III will not add to an atmosphere of confrontation in the Middle East, where serious efforts for a just and lasting peace are now under way.

346. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan): My delegation finds it necessary to offer a brief explanation of its vote in favour of draft resolution III because of the repeated assertions by those who opposed it that it constitutes an organized attack against Judaism as a religion or the followers of the Jewish faith as a people. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Arabs, both Muslims and Christians, have lived together with the peoples of the Jewish faith for centuries. The Muslim peoples shared many spiritual and cultural links with them. We do recognize and respect Jewish contributions to human progress. Our hands are not guilty of the Holocaust suffered by the Jewish people during the present century, and their age-old sufferings from prejudice and racist arrogance. In the Middle Ages, the Arab and Muslim countries were a haven of refuge for the Jewish people, and the great Jewish scholars Abu-Barakat and Musa bin-Maimun lived and flourished in the Muslim courts of Baghdad and Cairo. It is our conviction and constant hope that the peoples of the three monotheistic States can once again live together in peace and harmony in the Holy Land as they did for centuries in the past.

347. What the Assembly has done today is to deplore the political manifestation of zionism in the Middle East, which led to the expulsion of the Palestinian people from their homes and which stands for their

continued dispersion and exile. The wrong that was done to that people cries out to be righted. As the representative of Pakistan said here the other day [2396th meeting], to deny justice in this case is to reject peace.

348. The essential question in the Middle East is that of building a just and lasting peace. The overheated rhetoric which we have heard today will not contribute to the achievement of this end, but it should not be allowed to sway us from the task of seeking such a peace in that troubled region. The most urgent task is to obtain the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories and to restore to the Palestinian people their legitimate national rights. My delegation hopes that the international community will continue to make all possible endeavours towards these goals on the basis of the decisions which the United Nations has taken on this subject, including the two resolutions on the Palestine question adopted by the Assembly this morning [resolutions 3375 (XXX) and 3376 (XXX)].

349. Mr. RIVAS (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Colombia abstained in the vote, in both the Third Committee and the Assembly, on draft resolution III, which determines that zionism is a form of racial discrimination, because we do not agree with the declaration it contains. It is for this reason that, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to state that Colombia does not feel bound, as far as zionism is concerned, to comply with the recommendations of the General Assembly appearing in the resolutions on the struggle against racial discrimination adopted thus far by this Organization, resolutions which had the affirmative vote of my delegation.

350. Mr. MICHEL (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like, at this time, to explain its vote on the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for action to eliminate racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

351. My country suffered from discrimination up until its independence. It has helped colonial peoples to throw off the yoke of colonialism. In the United Nations, our delegation has always fought against *apartheid* and it voted for the International Convention against this racist system. For this reason, it would have been pleased to vote for the whole of the Programme against racism and racial discrimination. It would have voted without any reservation in favour of draft resolutions I and II included under that Programme, because they provide for the elimination of racism and racial discrimination. However, draft resolution III, in which zionism is subsumed as a form of racial discrimination, distorts the whole Programme.

352. My delegation took its stand on this resolution on 16 October in the Third Committee. We voted against the draft resolution which became draft resolution III. We consider this draft resolution out of place in a programme to combat racism and racial discrimination. Since draft resolution III is linked to draft resolutions I and II, my delegation has had to abstain on draft resolutions I and II and to vote deliberately against draft resolution III.

353. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly has heard the last speaker on my list in explanation of vote after the vote on the draft

resolutions concerning item 68. Three representatives, those of Belgium, Ireland and Saudi Arabia, have asked to be permitted to exercise the right of reply, and in accordance with previous decisions and with the practice of the General Assembly, I shall call upon them to do so at the end of the meeting, when we have concluded our consideration of the other reports of the Third Committee.

354. The Assembly will now consider the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 77.

355. I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

356. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to point out that it is 9.25 p.m., and we have been sitting here since about 3.30 p.m. I think it would be only fair for the Assembly to adjourn until tomorrow.

357. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The President is at the disposition of the Assembly, but I should like to point out that, according to information available to me, the remaining items can be dealt with very rapidly, since no representatives have asked to explain their votes on the draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee that are still to be considered. It seems to me that in a very short time we could conclude our consideration of these items and hear the three representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply on the item that was debated this afternoon.

358. Naturally, it is for the Assembly to decide whether to postpone its work until tomorrow, although, as I have said, I believe we could complete our work fairly rapidly if we continue with it immediately.

359. If no formal motion for the adjournment of this meeting is made, I shall take it that we can proceed with our consideration of item 77, in the hope that we shall be able to conclude our work as soon as possible.

360. The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Third Committee on item 77 [A/10309], concerning the 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. As no delegation has asked to speak in explanation of vote, we shall immediately turn to the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee, which appears in paragraph 8 of its report. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

361. I shall now put operative paragraph 4 to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar,

Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, New Zealand, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 79 votes to 12, with 22 abstentions.

362. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions (resolution 3382 (XXX)).

363. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now turn to the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 78, entitled "Adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa". The report of the Third Committee is in document A/10321. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee and contained in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 3383 (XXX)).

364. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now consider the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 69, concerning human rights and scientific and technological developments [A/10330]. The draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee for adoption by the Assembly appears in paragraph 18 of the report and contains a draft declaration on the use of scientific and technological progress in the interests of peace and for the benefit of mankind.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 20 abstentions (resolution 3384 (XXX)).

365. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee and contained in paragraph 19 of its report.

The draft decision was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

366. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since no delegation has requested to explain its vote after the vote, this concludes our consideration of agenda items 77, 78 and 69. We shall now hear those representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply.

367. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): At the beginning of this afternoon, during the debate on the procedural motion which I submitted on behalf of my delegation a colleague accused me of issuing ultimatums. Another colleague, who is in addition an old and good friend, confined himself to saying that I was applying pressure.

368. I can assure both those colleagues that, in a more or less distant past, my country was subjected both to ultimatums and to intolerable pressure, which proves that I know how unpleasant it is to be exposed to these. I can assure them that at no time has either my Government or my delegation engaged in intimidation, nor shall we do so in the future.

369. The first colleague I referred to went even further. He went so far as to doubt the validity of the position taken by my Government on the subject of racial discrimination. For his sake, and for his sake alone, I should like to say that, since the beginning of the Decade, we have voted in favour of draft resolution I. This year we did it twice, once in the Economic and Social Council and again in the Third Committee.

370. As to draft resolution II concerning the convening in Ghana of the world conference on the Decade, the Belgian delegation, both in the Economic and Social Council and in the Third Committee, warmly supported the candidacy of Ghana as organizer of that conference.

371. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): Mr. President, I apologise to you and to the members of the General Assembly for having to ask to speak once more, but I feel I must refer again, in order completely to clarify

the situation, to the statements by the representative of Kuwait about diplomatic relations with South Africa.

372. This is an extremely important issue of principle for us and it is essential that the position should be made clear. In an earlier statement this afternoon, the representative of Kuwait stated from this podium that the nine members of EEC have diplomatic relations with South Africa. Now, I cannot speak for the nine, but I can certainly speak for Ireland. Ireland does not have now, nor did it ever have, diplomatic relations with South Africa. We do not even exchange career consuls. Ireland merely has one honorary consul in Johannesburg, and the South Africans have appointed one Irish citizen as honorary trade representative in Ireland. He is not even an honorary consul. As I am sure my colleagues in this Assembly will appreciate, this is the very minimum necessary for the protection of the interests of our citizens, and of course it is a very different thing from the diplomatic relations—I stress the words diplomatic relations—to which the Kuwaiti representative referred in his original statement. I must ask that this point be made clear in the record of this meeting as it is an important issue of principle for us that we do not now have and never have had diplomatic relations with South Africa.

373. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel constrained to exercise the right of reply, in particular to what the representative of the United States, Mr. Moynihan, said in explanation of his vote this evening. I will remind him of certain terms that he used that were even shunned at the height of the cold war.

374. I know that there is détente between the Soviet Union and the United States, but even when the cold war prevailed the United States representatives and the Soviet representatives were more polite in their interventions, which were in opposition.

375. Mr. Moynihan said that the assessment of zionism as being tantamount to racism was a lie. Well, in this host country we know that the word "lie" means nothing. I have heard Americans call one another liars and bastards, but that was in jest. They say, "You bastard" or "You liar", but we cannot accept in this Assembly terminology that by tradition we consider to be an insult. In our part of the world, if someone calls another person a liar in public he reacts; he may even kill the man, and the judge may exonerate him for having been roused by such insults. Let the representatives of the host country beware: we are not used to such appellations, and we will not get used to them.

376. He said "It is a lie" again and again. Do the United States and the Western European Powers have a monopoly of the truth? Where is your decorum, my good friend Mr. Moynihan? You are entitled to your opinion. You might have said we were mistaken. But we are liars, 72 liars? Do you have a monopoly of the truth? You were a professor at Harvard and you should not be so conclusive in your attitudes to others.

377. Mr. Moynihan stated that the adoption of the resolution on zionism was an infamous act. Tell me, Mr. Moynihan, was the partition of Palestine a famous act? I do not know how old you were then; you were

a kid. Ask me about the partition of Palestine. One of your former Presidents, the late Mr. Truman—may God rest his soul in peace—said in his memoirs, "I am pestered day and night by the Zionists". And when the State Department of the United States told Mr. Truman not to precipitate matters because the United States would alienate the people of the Middle East, he said, "Tell me how many Arab constituents do I have? Thousands upon thousands of Zionists are pestering me for partition." I am, of course, paraphrasing, as I do not have the memoirs here. As I have said time and again in referring to those State Department officials, who are they, those boys in striped pants, to tell the President of the United States what he should do?

378. It is a shameful act, you said, to call the Zionists racists. Is the dispersal of a couple of million Palestinians by Zionists a pious, justifiable act? Was Mr. Morgenthau, who happened to be a Jew, your Ambassador to Turkey in 1917, wrong when he said you would arouse America in the long run against such Jews as identified their interests with that country and they did not want to set themselves apart. Why do you not see the other side of the coin? The father of the famous Jewish violinist Yehudi Menuhin, Moshe Menuhin, who wrote *The Decadence of Zionism in our Times*,¹⁴ said—and I am paraphrasing—that the Zionists were setting themselves apart as having a monopoly over what is right and wrong, and that this was a sign of decadence. Read his book, Professor Moynihan. It is available here; perhaps not in the United Nations library, but you can find it anywhere, and I shall be happy to send you a copy if you cannot find one.

379. Mr. Moynihan reaffirmed what the Zionists rationalized time and again, that zionism was a liberation movement based on Biblical prophecies. Why do you not, my good friend Mr. Moynihan, support the liberation of the Red Indians, for that matter, who have been placed in reservations? Why do you not start that liberation movement at home?

380. The Palestinian people were sold down the Thames by Mr. Balfour and down the Potomac by Mr. Truman. And the late Mr. Woodrow Wilson returned to the United States from Versailles a broken man when he found the Allies, none other than the United Kingdom and France, placing Arab countries under mandates, which was colonialism in disguise.

381. Where were you then, Mr. Moynihan? Of course you may say you were not born. But you are a professor. Why do you not consult the books of history? Do you know anything about the Crane mission? Mr. Crane was sent by your Government to find out what was what in Palestine. None of your United States representatives here mention a word about Mr. Crane's report. He said it would be an injustice to create a state in a country that is populated by Palestinians.

382. What business had Mr. Balfour and Mr. Truman to create an imbroglio in our midst? What have the Palestinians, and for that matter all the Arabs in the region, done to the United Kingdom and the United States? Why at a distance of six or seven thousand miles do you put your finger in our pie? "Ah", you might say, "if we did not, the Soviet Union would take over the Middle East". We are not clients of yours nor of the Soviet Union. You wanted to be

free. You fought for your freedom 200 years ago. What brought you to our area?

383. But what about the influence that the Zionists had on you here? I find a gentleman sitting next to you, none other than Senator Humphrey, well known not only in the United States but everywhere: Can he in private, in earnest, tell me that all these years the Zionists have not brought pressure to bear on the United States to follow the policy that has boomeranged and is alienating all the people of the Arab world, nay, the people of the Muslim world and not only the people of the Muslim world, but the people of the third world—not only the people of the third world, all the people who had been oppressed by the colonial Powers?

384. Mr. Moynihan, my dear friend, I should like still to call you my dear friend, because brothers sometimes have differences. Please, you and Mr. Garment, your representative on the Third Committee, desist from using the word "obscene". You cited the English dictionary. You know what "obscene" means—foul, filthy, dirty, offensive to chastity. We do not use obscene words. What about the obscenity that spreads its tentacles all over the western world in pornography—*porne*, the ancient Greek harlot in literature, and *graphos*? Who deals in obscenity, Mr. Moynihan? You do not have to go to 42nd Street. It has permeated the western world because of the laxity that people in authority are exercising under the umbrella of human rights. This is license, irresponsibility. And you use the word "obscene" in conjunction with 72 nations which voted for the so-called Zionist resolution? I am certain if you had known how hurt 72 States would be by such language, you would not have used it. You have been to India. As an ambassador, you should have learned a little of the Indian decorum. You have been to Asia. You have not lived like an oyster in Chesapeake Bay or in Boston. You have been around. Weigh your words. I could call you a hundred names, but I desist because I defer to my dignity and I respect you as a human being.

385. I can hardly add to what my colleague from Kuwait said in trying to make clear how we consider zionism as being tantamount to racism. Time and again I have told you for the last 26 or 27 years that we have no quarrel with Judaism. But it was European Jews who started this movement. They had nothing to do with our Jews. They used Judaism, a noble religion, for a political and economic end.

386. What have we done to you at a distance of six or seven thousand miles for you to interfere in our affairs? If you want to consider our part of the world a sphere of influence, as other nations—big Powers—are doing, it is your privilege, perhaps, although I decry the old approach to international affairs, because had it not been for the deterrence of terror, we would have been plunged into a third world war.

387. When the Zionists contend that they do not want to live side by side in a bi-national or any other State because they are exclusive and God gave them Palestine—since when was God in the real estate business, my good friend Mr. Moynihan? Show us the title deed. And since when did He give Mr. Balfour and Mr. Truman powers-of-attorney to transfer land that does not belong to them—land that was populated by people who, some of them at least, had at one time been

Jews and who embraced Christianity because they got fed up with some of their rabbis, our rabbis who were fundamentalists? Does God parcel out land?

388. You know very well, my good friend Mr. Moynihan, that Zion allegedly is the site of King David's grave. This is why there is reverence for Mount Zion and in the Psalms it is said "I look up to the hills". It is the spiritual zionism that we thought at one time would prevail.

389. Hence, even Balfour in his declaration mentioned "national home", not national State, although he had no legal authority over that part of the world. It was a mandate, and the Jews were hardly 6 per cent of the population. You stand for democracy and you stand for "one person, one vote". Did the British and the Americans care to find out by a plebiscite whether the Palestinian people would accept an alien element on the basis of Biblical prophecies? Ask me about the Bible and about the monotheistic religions of the Middle East. I believe that you once told me that you are Catholic, and that you do not read the Bible, you let your priests propound it for you. I read the Bible.

390. In our area we talk in hyperboles, in analogies, in figures of speech. Do you mean to tell me that you still believe that Eve was a rib of Adam and that that eloquent serpent told Eve: "Now take this apple; eat it and you will learn wisdom; and tell Adam to have a bite too"? By biting apples, one does not gain wisdom. These are symbols, my good friend Mr. Moynihan. You take them literally when it suits your political purpose.

391. And can our illustrious friend, Senator Humphrey—whose presence here heartens me—tell me why 76 Senators automatically marched at the behest of the Zionists? Of course, the Zionists own most of the mass media of information, and political campaigns depend on the mass media—campaigns for the election not only of Senators and Congressmen but also even of the President of the United States. God help any candidate in this country who is not supported by the Zionists! God help him! And the Federal Government does not help out this City of New York, which I knew under La Guardia. I hope that because we live here Senator Humphrey will help the city. But immediately the Senate will vote \$2,500 million to give to Israel, and Egypt gets the consolation prize—\$500 or \$600 million. \$2,500 million goes to Israel. Why? Because it is a "bastion of democracy". What democracy? Ritualized democracy? Religion was ritualized before democracy. That is why people went to churches and in two world wars prayed to Jesus the Prince of Peace, who said: "Love thy enemy as thyself". And the next day they cut each other's throats.

392. What have we done to you, my good friends the Americans? We have common interests with you; we want to increase those interests with you—not only the Saudi Arabians, but many Arabs. You say to us: "If we do not act like that, the Soviet Union—communism—will overtake you." But what brought the Communists into our midst? Your policies.

393. There are many Arab States which are friends of the Soviet Union—not friends in the journalistic sense but friends because the Soviet Union helps them. And the Soviet Union is happy watching you make mistakes. At one time I told my good friend, none

other than Mr. Gromyko—if I may call him that, because I have known him for some 28 years—"But you voted for partition." I had made a speech in which I referred to perverted democracy. And Mr. Gromyko told me: "Are we to be considered amongst the perverted democracies?" I said: "We have an Arabic proverb which says: 'If you put a saddle needle in your inside pocket, it pricks you under the arm'". He put his hand in his inside pocket and said: "I have no saddle needle." I said: "Search in your other pocket", because he also precipitated the partition of Palestine.

394. The Senator from Vermont, Senator Austin, your permanent representative here in 1947, toyed with the idea of not precipitating partition, to see whether we could still find a solution. But your Mr. Truman took matters into his own hands. General Romulo, one of the patriarchs of the United Nations, made a speech at Lake Success for about one hour against partition. You say that you do not at all use pressure? He received word from his Government that he should vote for partition. He was such an honourable man that he left New York. Pressure was brought to bear on his then President, and the Ambassador of the Philippines in Washington was sent to raise his hand for partition.

395. What business did Cardinal Spellman have to support the Zionists against us? He was dispatched to Latin America to get votes, which he did. But at the end of his life he regretted it. I was told by one of his friends that he said: "I did not know that partition was going to create such trouble."

396. The Soviet Union has no right to interfere; only you have the right to interfere.

397. I shall not say "at it is a great shame that you should have engaged in such diatribes against 72 nations which, to the best of their knowledge, thought that the Zionists had gone too far—their exclusivity; the chosen people of God, as if God discriminates and chooses one people. That is what we are fighting here: discrimination. What fiction! And suppose that certain people do not believe in God and are atheists? You say: "Because of our historical background we should be in Palestine." But the Canaanites were in Palestine before even our oriental Jews, who are our brothers, as I said time and again, came southward from Ur of the Chaldees in what today is western Iraq. Whom do you think you are fooling here? Propaganda? Barocdy does not engage in propaganda; he tells you historical facts.

398. You Zionists play on the emotions of the fundamentalists amongst the Christians—whether Catholic or Protestant—and say: "the Judeo-Christian background."

399. But God—assuming that we believe in Christianity and in Islam, as well as in Judaism—God sent Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary. But you renounced Him, you called Him a false prophet. You want to wait until a messiah of your own choosing comes to this earth.

400. But all this is rationalization, making Judaism, a noble religion, the motivation for political and economic ends. You are not fooling anybody. As I have said time and again, I was on speaking terms with the Zionists until 1944. Time and again I said: "Come and live as Jews; don't ask for a State." "No, we want a

State because God gave us Palestine." And even Mr. Eban, at this rostrum, mentioned it, which made me come over and tell him what I have just said: "Since when has God been in the real estate business?" Mr. Eban is a man who studied evolution at Cambridge or Oxford. And Mr. Herzog is a learned man, he is a writer of books. And he comes and plays on your sentiments.

401. You Americans, my good friends, wake up: we do not want you to hate anybody. We do not hate the Zionists. I personally feel sorry for them, because they are misguided and, as many non-Zionist Jews have told me, they have developed a psychosis. We have an Arabic proverb which says: "God have mercy upon them who know where to stop and stop there". They do not know where to stop. Their forebears never laid eyes on Palestine. They are an alien people in our midst. The French and British have a Christian religion, which is Christianity, but that does not make Semites of them. The Nigerians, for that matter, or the Indonesians have a Semitic religion, Islam; but that does not make of them a Semitic people.

402. Yet Zionism would gather in, if it could, 16 million Jews dispersed all over the world, many of whom have identified themselves with their country of birth or of adoption and have done very well for themselves in the field of business or science or culture. Yet the Zionists still want to claim them as an exclusive people just because they practise Judaism, maintaining that they should be "enfolded" in Palestine, because God gave them Palestine—although I do not think that any of the Zionists have direct or indirect communication with God Almighty.

403. This fiction should be dissipated. This exclusivity and exclusiveness, this setting themselves apart from other people will be the bane of the Zionists; and if, God forbid, they become the scapegoat in any society, people like myself will be in the forefront to save them from the claws of those who would think that all their ills came from the Zionists. Do not think that what happened before may not recur.

404. I am glad that there is an illustrious representative of the Senate in our midst. He may not perhaps have the same viewpoint as I do, but at least he can educate his fellow Senators not to march blindly for political considerations and hurt the Palestinian people, who, for the information of the delegation of the United States, had been Jews and were converted to Christianity after the Temple was destroyed by the Romans in 70 A.D. and when Byzantium ruled that part of the world and used Christianity as a motivation for a political and economic end. And in the seventh century, when a new religion appeared on the horizon, Islam, many of those Christians, many of whom had been Jews, embraced Islam. And the Khazars, whose forebears came from the northern tier of Asia and who had embraced Judaism in the eighth century A.D., claimed Palestine as their own, dispersing the Palestinian people, the indigenous population of the land.

405. If this is not tantamount to racism and discrimination, what is?

406. They want to set the pendulum of history back and make a people out of a religion. You cannot do that. A people consists of those who belong to the same

geographic region, who have common interests, who usually have a common language and a common way of life. That is what constitutes a people. At one time the Anglo-Saxons considered themselves a people. But when I went to England I found out the Anglo-Saxons were not only Angles and Saxons: they were Celts, they were Scots, people of Yorkshire, people of the Isle of Man; and each of those ethnological strains was mixed with others. What about the Normans, who slew Harold in 1066? They were from northern France.

407. There is no such thing as race: it is an oversimplification for the classroom; and Professor Moynihan should know better. It is the attitude, that sense of superiority, that sense of exclusiveness, that determines discrimination. It is not prejudice.

408. I have spent a lifetime in the Third Committee, 30 years, trying to understand what discrimination is. And you call our action obscene. Go and clean your country of obscenity, Mr. Moynihan—we will help you, if you want us to—before you speak such foul language. If you are strong, well, more power to you, but use your strength for justice, not to support shady causes.

409. No, I will oppose tyranny to my last breath in my part of the world, and I will continue to oppose tyranny wherever I find it. And do not give us those rubrics, those slogans, saying that you are upholding democracy. Did you act democratically in the partition of Palestine? Do not ritualize democracy; let democracy be in the behaviour of each one of us. It begins with our self-restraint, and not in licence. For heaven's sake, wake up, because before long—unless there is a man of the hour such as you, Mr. Humphrey, or somebody else to set this great nation on the right path—you will not be able to save this city from bankruptcy.

410. Go and help the Zionists, to the tune not of two and a half billion dollars but of 20 billion dollars, while the city here is bordering on bankruptcy. There are Jews here, 2 million Jews, in New York City. Why do you not help this city? Why do you not make of New York the fifty-first state and bring in many of those Jews who were misled into going to Israel and are fed up? I have heard that many of them wanted to go back to the Soviet Union, but they have been warned by the Soviet Union that if they left they could not come back, so they were coming here.

411. Why do you support people from the Soviet Union who are against the Soviet Union? That phase has passed. There were placards here 10 or 15 years ago, "Free Europe", "Free the Slaves of Europe". Now they have taken them down when they saw that the Soviet Union could not easily be beaten because it was strong. I say to my colleagues from the Soviet Union that although Saudi Arabia does not recognize communism, that does not prevent my having a good rapport with them. I am not like Joseph McCarthy, who thought they had cholera or something. The Soviet people are people. They are becoming capitalistic, while your ideology is neither fish nor fowl. We do not know whether it is capitalism or socialism any more. It is *étatisme*. The Soviet Union is using the mechanics of capitalism that they learned from the United States. Wake up, because we like you. We like the people of the Soviet Union. Friends have visited

there, and came back and said the Soviet people were very good people. Have a new approach. Do not dabble in spheres of influence, because the policy of spheres of influence and balance of power has backfired. It is people like Senator Humphrey who should teach the Americans a new approach so that no "ism" will prevail and the Zionists will become good Jews and be able to live side by side with the Arabs in a binational State, or any other instrumentality of a State; because if they do not seek acceptance among them, we will assimilate them or shut them out.

412. Where is Alexander the Great? Where are the Seleucids, the Romans, the Byzantines, the Mongols who came to the area? I am not talking about the Semitic Powers that came before them. Where are our brothers the Turks, who ruled at one time over the Middle East? Where are the British and French Mandates? Where are their empires? They went down the drain, and only God is great. We had three empires. The Arabs became drunk with power and with wealth, and they fell. For Heaven's sake, learn from history. You are only 200 years old. That is a lovely age to be, culturally. Learn from the history of the past. Do not call us names if you do not agree with us; but if you do, by mistake, wash your mouth out lest the foulness stay therein.

413. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait): Mindful that it is close to 10.30 and that I am speaking immediately after my good friend the representative of Saudi Arabia, I feel doubly constrained to be brief and to the point, even though there are statements from three representatives to which I should like to make replies.

414. The representative of Ireland returned once again to the question of relations between Ireland and South Africa. What he reiterated does not differ at all from what I cited on the basis of document A/AC.115/L.415. It is true that he gave us additional information, the size of the missions involved and the identity of people and so on, but unfortunately that information was not available to me. Unfortunately, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* did not deem it necessary to give us all those details, and if the representative of Ireland thinks it is important to have that information on the record, I earnestly invite him to ask the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to issue a corrigendum and have additional foot-notes to the table giving the details he deemed it necessary to give to us.

415. Regarding the statement made by the representative of Belgium, he took exception to the word "ultimatums". We take exception to being treated by ultimatums. We have been patiently listening since 3 October to representatives of the Western Powers telling the United Nations that unless this resolution was defeated they would reconsider their support for the Decade, they would withdraw their support from the Decade, and so on. Are we playing semantic games, whether this is an ultimatum, or a warning, or a threat? The important thing is that the United Nations is being told by a minority of States that, regardless of democratic rules, regardless of parliamentary rules, the minority is asking the majority to change its mind under duress or else something grave will happen. If that is not an ultimatum, I do not know what is.

416. In replying to that I pointed out that this was a fraudulent ultimatum. I pointed to the fact that the promised support for the Decade in case of the defeat of the draft resolution on zionism was itself fraudulent support, because the United Nations was promised a vote for a Decade, words about a Decade which is supposed to be a Decade for action. I pointed to the record of States that were serving this ultimatum upon us, and if the representative of Belgium wants specifically the record of Belgium regarding South Africa, whose chastisement, isolation, frustration and defeat are the objectives of the Decade, I will remind the Assembly what that record is.

417. Belgium opposed the first report of the Credentials Committee rejecting the credentials of South Africa.

418. Belgium opposed the ruling of the President of the General Assembly suspending South Africa from participation in the twenty-ninth session.

419. Belgium is listed as having diplomatic or official relations with South Africa—in fact, in order to avert any more details like those regarding Ireland, I shall give the relations between Belgium and South Africa. Belgium maintains a diplomatic mission in South Africa and a consular mission in South Africa, and South Africa maintains a diplomatic mission, a consular mission, a commercial and technical mission, an information office, an emigration office and a military, naval and air attaché in Belgium, the last-mentioned resident in the Federal Republic of Germany.

420. Belgium is one of the major trading partners of South Africa. Belgium has one of the cities served by South African Airways. And so on, and so on.

421. Is that a country earnestly coming to tell us "But for the resolution on zionism we would have participated whole-heartedly in the Decade for action to destroy the *apartheid* system in South Africa"? I do not think any of us is gullible enough or foolish enough to believe that the answer is "yes".

422. I would say a word or two about the long statement made by the representative of the United States. In the first place, I have read Professor Moynihan and I must admit that Professor Moynihan is much more persuasive than Ambassador Moynihan. The representative of the United States came with a facetious argument. He commented on something I had said regarding the definition of racial discrimination by the United Nations, and he said that the United Nations did not define racism. And then he created an absurd syllogism out of which he thought he reached an absurd conclusion, that zionism is a form of nazism, or the other way around—I even forget what he said. But in all this diversionary trick, he forgot to answer the question: does the definition of racial discrimination adopted by the United Nations apply to zionism or does it not? Do I take it that Mr. Moynihan's silence on the question of racial discrimination means that he half agrees with the resolution; that he only questions zionism as being a form of racism, but does not question zionism as being a form of racial discrimination?

423. Because he admitted that there is a United Nations definition on that, but then, instead of answering the question—does that definition apply to zionism or not?—he went off at a tangent to give us

his own philosophy of racism. He left unanswered the question: does the United States agree that zionism perpetrates racial discrimination, or does it not? In the light of his silence, I would presume to believe that it is implicit agreement to the statement that zionism is a form of racial discrimination.

424. Finally, unlike my good friend Mr. Baroody, I am not chagrined by verbal abuse. The insolent railing, the name-calling, to which the delegation of the United States has resorted both inside and outside the United Nations ever since 3 October—"perverse", "obscene", "indecent" and, today, "lies" have graced and punctuated the statements of the representatives of the United States. I am not chagrined and I am not disconcerted. Long, long ago in my first elementary course in philosophy, I was told by my professors: "Only when you have no argument, should you resort to name-calling". Name-calling is no substitute for rational discourse, name-calling is an admission of intellectual bankruptcy.

The meeting rose at 10.35 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, First Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 77th meeting, pp. 131-132.

² *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, First Committee, 2063rd meeting, p. 36.

³ *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, Third Committee, 2134th meeting, para. 61.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2121st meeting, para. 24, and 2132nd meeting, paras. 44-46.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2117th meeting, paras. 38-41.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2123rd meeting, para. 3.

⁷ A/AC.115/L.415.

⁸ Theodor Herzl, *The Complete Diaries* (New York, Herzl Press, 1969).

⁹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Third Committee*, 2181st meeting, para. 22.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 2134th meeting, para. 58.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 23-25.

¹² *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Third Committee, 1644th meeting.

¹³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year*, No. 71, 299th meeting.

¹⁴ Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1969.