

UN Resolution on Zionism

TWO EVENTS at the 30th session of the UN General Assembly were illustrative of the political and ideological tendencies prevailing in the human rights work of the UN. One was the United States presentation—and subsequent withdrawal in the face of imminent rejection—of a draft resolution on “Amnesty for political prisoners” in the Third Committee, on November 12, 1975 (A/C.3/L2175); the other was the adoption by the General Assembly, on November 10, 1975, of Resolution 3379, which “Determines that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.”¹

United States delegate Patrick D. Moynihan, in the argument for his amnesty resolution, pointed out that two General Assembly committees already had approved, with United States support, resolutions on amnesty for political prisoners—in South Africa and Chile. “Is there, however, any reason to stop there,” he asked, “to limit our concern to only two members of the UN, when there are altogether 142 [now 144] members?” And, he added:

... the selective morality of the UN in matters of human rights threatens the integrity not merely of the UN, but of human rights themselves. . . . Unless standards of human rights are seen to be applied uniformly and neutrally to all nations, regardless of the nature of their regimes or the size of their armaments . . . it will quickly be seen that it is not human rights which are invoked . . . but simply arbitrary political standards dressed up in the guise of human rights.

Though the United States initiative failed, it drew attention to two critical aspects of the international human rights problem: the suppression of the right of peaceful dissent in many countries; and the UN’s “selective morality,” dwelling on alleged wrongs in a few states while protecting others from criticism. The latter condition was even more dramatically highlighted by the debate and voting on Resolution 3379.

Hostile references to Zionism were nothing new at the UN. For many years they had been a staple of Arab and Communist anti-Israel rhetoric, not only in debates on the Middle East but in many others as well. In the early 1960s, for example, a Communist-Arab coalition, by moving to insert into the text of the draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination such a reference, had blocked a United States-Brazil proposal to include a condemnation of antisemitism.

With the growth of Arab influence, resulting from the increase in UN member-

¹See Appendix for full text of resolution.

ship, and the change in international alliances—giving the anti-Israel forces assurance of 19 Arab votes, the 16 Communist votes, most of the votes of the 47 Organization of African Unity (OAU) states and of most other nonaligned countries—the radical Arabs accelerated their offensive in the UN.

It was intensified in the wake of the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war and, again, after the Yom Kippur war of October 1973, and moved into high gear at the General Assembly's 1973–1975 sessions. During that period, other UN bodies like the Commission on Human Rights and various specialized agencies, besides granting the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) official observer status, adopted critical or punitive resolutions against Israel, including references to Zionism.

Thus, on December 14, 1973, Israel and Zionism were equated—for the first time—with racism in General Assembly Resolution 315, which “condemns, in particular, the unholy alliance between Portuguese colonialism, South African racism, Zionism and Israeli imperialism.” In November 1974 the UNESCO General Conference voted to withhold aid from Israel in the fields of education, science, and culture, and to exclude it from UNESCO's European regional group, the only one to which it had a chance of admittance (AJYB, 1976 [Vol. 76], pp. 158–59).

On February 21, 1975, the Commission on Human Rights, by a vote of 22 in favor, 1 against, and 9 abstentions, adopted a resolution on human rights violations in the occupied territories, which deplored Israel's “continued grave violations” of international law and conventions, in particular the 1949 Geneva Convention on the protection of civilians in war time, “as war crimes and an affront to humanity.” Another example was the declaration and measures adopted at the International Women's Year (IWY) Conference held in Mexico City in June 1975 (pp. 115–17).

Anti-Israel Moves: General Assembly, 1975

On the morning of November 10, 1975, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 3375 requesting that the PLO, as representative of the people of Palestine, be permitted to take part in all conferences on the Middle East on an equal footing with all other parties. It adopted a second resolution, 3376, establishing a special committee to recommend a program for implementing the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and requesting the Security Council to adopt measures which would enable the Palestinian people to exercise these rights. On December 5 it adopted Resolution 3414 calling on all states to cut off economic and military aid to Israel so long as it held on to occupied territory or denied the national rights of the Palestinian people. Ten days later it adopted a three-part resolution, 3525, deploring Israel's “continued and persistent violation” of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and calling on its Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories to continue its investigations. Resolution 3379, adopted on the afternoon of November 10, was thus but one of a spate of anti-Israel measures adopted during the General Assembly's 1975 session.

Various interpretations have been offered of the immediate impetus for, and the

timing of, the resolution. Some believed that it was casually initiated as a routine rhetorical harassment and that the intensity of the reaction, largely attributable to the diplomatic style of Ambassador Moynihan, was not anticipated. Others viewed it as a "consolation" prize given Arab radicals by Third World moderates who, at the Kampala, Uganda, meeting of the Organization of African Unity in spring 1975 and at the Lima, Peru, meeting of nonaligned states in the summer, had refused to endorse the proposal of the radicals to seek Israel's suspension or expulsion at the forthcoming Assembly. Still others saw it as an effort by the radicals to recoup the prestige and position they had lost as a result of Egypt's Sinai agreement with Israel and to shift the scene back to the UN where they enjoyed strategic advantages.

Whatever the immediate causes, the resolution's true nature and the ultimate purpose of many, if not all, of its Arab sponsors clearly was to undermine the legitimacy of the State of Israel in world opinion and in UN jurisprudence, thereby laying the basis for its suspension or expulsion from the world organization. In other words, while the attack was directed against Zionism, its real target was the state of Israel.² The aim was to legitimate continuing pressure and attacks on that "racist" state, as against South Africa, both within and outside the UN system, in order to eliminate it and replace it by a Palestinian Arab state, and to intimidate Jews and other friends of Israel into withdrawing their support.

Leonard Garment, United States representative to the Commission on Human Rights, expressed a similar view in an April 1, 1976, address assessing the UN Commission on Human Rights. In it he saw at work a conspiratorial pattern to weaken "the ideas and forms of the democratic West" and to strengthen "the ideas and forms of totalitarianism." A part of this pattern, he stated, was the use of the human rights concepts developed by the UN largely as a result of Western initiatives to "erode the legitimacy of the State of Israel. The syllogism is by now a familiar one: Racism is illegal; Zionism is racism; Israel is a Zionist State; Israel is therefore illegal. So step by step, resolution by resolution, in New York, Geneva, Nairobi, at UNCTAD [UN Conference on Trade and Development], WHO [World Health Organization] and so on, Israel is to be cast out of the international community."³

Zionism Resolution and Decade Against Racism

The attack on Zionism began in the Assembly's Third Committee on October 2, 1975, when Cuba, South Yemen, Libya, Somalia, and Syria jointly introduced

²Said Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*: "The very idea of a sovereign Jewish state in the Middle East (Zionism), let alone the actuality of one, no matter what its boundaries might be, was by *definition* declared criminal (racist). In the eyes of this resolution, Israel could only cease to be criminal if it ceased to be both Jewish and sovereign—if, in other words, it ceased to exist. Returning to the boundaries of 1967 or even the boundaries of 1948 would not make the slightest difference" ("The Abandonment of Israel," *Commentary*, July 1976, p. 23).

³New York Times, April 2, 1976.

an amendment (A/C. 3/L.2157) to a routine Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) draft resolution relating to the UN Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (A/10145). The word "zionism" was to be inserted into the text wherever critical references to *apartheid*, racism, racial discrimination, colonialism, and/or alien domination appeared. And a new operative paragraph was to "Consider(s) zionism as a form of racial discrimination to be included in the Decade. "

The Decade, launched by a General Assembly resolution on November 10, 1973, called on UN bodies and specialized agencies, governments, regional intergovernmental organization, nongovernmental organizations, educational institutions, mass media, and other sectors of society to join in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. The program annexed to the resolution included recommendations favoring the establishment of governmental complaint procedures; the elimination of discrimination in educational systems and immigration policies; involvement of the mass media in public education against racial discrimination; support for people suffering from racial oppression, including the creation of regional and international aid funds; updating existing UN racial studies and undertaking new ones, and production for public use of film, radio, and TV programs on racial questions. By incorporating Resolution 3379, this program offered innumerable opportunities for anti-Zionist and anti-Israel political activity and propaganda.

Vigorous objections from the United States and Western European as well as from several Latin American and African delegations—many of the last out of concern that the inclusion of Zionism would lessen support for the Decade and blur its focus on Southern Africa—led to the withdrawal of the amendments. It was hoped that this would end the matter. Then, on October 16, Somalia, joined by two dozen other states—19 Arab, two black African (Benin [Dahomey] and Guinea), Afghanistan, Cuba, and the Ukrainian SSR—introduced a new resolution (A/C. 3/6.2159) which seemed not to be tied to the Decade but dealt exclusively with Zionism.⁴ Prior to the voting, however, in response to an insistent query from Sierra Leone as to its pertinence to the various agenda items, Somalia, as spokesman for the sponsors of the resolution, stated for the record (A/C.3/SR.2133, p. 11) that it "was connected with agenda item 68(a)," namely the Decade.

The resolution was adopted by the Third Committee on October 17 after heated debate, during which Sierra Leone and Zambia unsuccessfully moved for deferral. Their deferral motion was defeated by a vote of 68 to 45, with 16 abstentions. The vote on the principal resolution was 70 to 29, with 29 abstentions (and 14 absentees). The yes votes thus totaled less than half of the UN membership at the time, 70 out of 142.

Before the vote, Leonard Garment charged that the Third Committee was about "to perform a supreme act of deceit, to make a massive attack on the moral realities

⁴It was later adopted by the plenary as Resolution 3379.

of the world;" that under the guise of a program to eliminate racism, it was endorsing antisemitism; that the resolution would both morally and politically discredit the UN's efforts against racism and would encourage antisemitism and group hostility. It was, he said, an "obscene act." On October 21, in an address before the Appeal of Conscience Foundation, Ambassador Moynihan said of the resolution:

The real problem is very different, and vastly ominous. It is that the UN has become a locus of a general assault by the majority of the nations in the world on the principles of liberal democracy which are now found only in a minority of nations, and for that a dwindling minority. It was not Zionism that was condemned so much as the significance of Israel as one of the very few places, outside of Western Europe and North America and a few offshore islands, where Western democratic principles survive, and of all such places, currently the most exposed.

He characterized the resolution as "the very quintessence of the totalitarian mode. A total inversion of meaning . . . a total distortion of truth . . . a reckless act, one of the most grievous errors in the 30-year life of the United Nations."⁵

Resolution in Plenary

THE VOTE

When the Third Committee's draft resolution came before the plenary session, Belgium, speaking for the European Economic Community (EEC), proposed, in the hope of killing the resolution for the current session and possibly forever, to defer it until the next Assembly session. The proposal was defeated 55 in favor, 67 against, with 15 abstentions (and 5 absentees). The deferral move would have won with a shift of seven votes, an outcome which well over half the members would have preferred.

Once the deferral motion was defeated, however, some states which voted for it or abstained (Mexico and Portugal, among others) felt obliged to vote for the principal resolution. It was passed by a vote of 72 to 35, with 32 abstentions and three absentees (Rumania, Spain, and South Africa).⁶ As pointed out by the UN Association—USA's *Interdependent*, "The combined 35 nays and 32 abstentions were the largest number to unite against an anti-Israel proposal in recent memory. "

The resolution's 72 supporters included the 19 members of the Arab League, 12 Communist states, 21 black African states (not counting Arab League members, but including some that are predominantly Muslim or with influential Muslim minorities), four Latin American countries (Brazil, Grenada, Guyana, and Mexico), and

⁵Press Release, USUN-123 (75).

⁶See Appendix for tabulation of vote.

three European states (Malta, Portugal, and Turkey). The 35 nos included five from Africa, one from Asia (Fiji), ten from Latin America, and 18 from the "Western European and other" (U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand) category. Abstentions included 12 black African, eight Asian, 11 Latin American, and one West European (Greece) states.

PROVISIONS

The resolution, itself, cited precedents in four of its five preambular paragraphs. The second recalled the General Assembly's condemnation, on December 14, 1973, of "the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism." The third noted the provision in the IWY declaration calling for the "elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, Zionism, apartheid and racial discrimination in all its forms. . . ." The fourth stated that Resolution 77, adopted by the Organization of African Unity at its 12th session in Kampala, Uganda (July 28-August 1, 1975), referred to "the racist regime in occupied Palestine," which had "a common imperialist origin" with "the racist regime in Zimbabwe."

The fifth paragraph of the preamble cited the declaration of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned Countries, held in Lima, Peru (August 25-30, 1975), which, it said, "most severely condemned Zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology." (Because of opposition by many black African states as well as by Egypt, then negotiating the interim Sinai agreement, both the Kampala and the Lima conferences had declined to approve the more radical Arab resolutions advocating Israel's expulsion from the UN, a call issued several weeks earlier in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, by a summit conference of the foreign ministers of 39 Islamic states and PLO.)

Resolution 3379 concluded with one operative sentence, which declared Zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination.

At the same meeting, just before the vote on the Zionism resolution, the General Assembly adopted two other resolutions under the same agenda item (i.e., "the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination"). One, adopted by a vote of 117 to 19, with 5 abstentions, called for measures to implement the program for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The other, adopted by a vote of 116 to 18, with seven abstentions, stated that a world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination was to be held as a major feature of the Decade. Those voting against, or abstaining on, these resolutions gave as reason the connection of the Decade with the Zionism resolution.

THE ARGUMENTS

Besides the officially designated plenary session spokesmen for and against the Zionism resolution—the representatives of Benin and Israel—many other delegates

spoke on the issues before and after the vote. Most incisive were Patrick D. Moynihan for the United States and Fayez al-Sayegh for Kuwait.

The debate touched on many issues—philosophical, semantic, political, legal, procedural. Among those discussed were: the motives of the resolution's sponsors—whether the target was the State of Israel or only the Zionist ideology or movement; the meaning of Zionism and racism—whether or not exact definitions existed and, if so, whether they had legal and scientific validity; Zionism's claim to being a national liberation movement; the purpose of the Decade Against Racism and the impact the resolution would have on it, as well as on the UN generally; the question of selective morality (or double standard), i.e., why this one state or ideology should be singled out; the proper role of the General Assembly—whether it should function as an instrument for harmonizing differences or as a forum for confrontation.

Arab speakers attacked Zionism and the State of Israel as though they were interchangeable, an equation which led to the implied but not explicitly stated conclusion that Israel, having been founded on the immoral and illegal basis of Zionism, had no right to exist. On the other hand, some non-Arab supporters of the resolution like Brazil, while affirming their recognition of Israel's right to exist, explained that their vote was based not on opposition to the state's existence, but on disapproval of particular actions by Israel, or of the Zionist ideology.

The supporting arguments were essentially repetitions of what had been said in every Middle East discussion since 1948 (with the addition, since 1967, of arguments centered on the Israeli occupation). Besides Benin and Kuwait, the main advocates of the resolution were Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria, the PLO observer, Cuba, and Yugoslavia. (No other Communist states participated.) They asserted, among other things, that Israel had expelled the indigenous Palestinian inhabitants to make room for European Jews, with the aim of establishing a Jewish state; that Israel oppressed, and discriminated against, the remaining Palestinian Arabs by the same methods as South Africa used against its black population; that European Israelis discriminated against Jews of Oriental background; that Israeli laws and practices (including the Law of Return giving all Jews the right to automatic Israeli citizenship immediately upon immigration, but denying this right to non-Jews) were discriminatory; that these laws, derived from Zionism, were inherently racist because they held that all Jews were one people having the right to their own state in biblical Palestine, to the exclusion of others, and that while Arabs abhorred Zionism, they respected individual Jews and the Jewish religion.

Sayegh, the principal speaker on the Arab side, pointed out that under the UN-approved definitions, as provided in Article 1 of both the UN Declaration and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, racial discrimination was not merely a question of color or genetics, but also descent and national and ethnic origin. Zionism, he argued, defined Jewishness in ethnic rather than strictly religious terms and entailed in both theory and practice discrimination against the original Arab inhabitants, who either had been expelled or were being treated as second-class citizens. Sayegh denied that Zionism was a

national liberation movement and rejected the equation of Zionism with Judaism and of anti-Zionism with antisemitism. Christian and Moslem Arabs, he maintained, revered Judaism as a religion. He attacked the motives of the West European states for opposing the Zionism resolution, challenging their good-faith commitment to the aims of the Decade, as proved by their support of South Africa.

The delegate of Benin was outspoken about how far the supporters of the resolution were prepared to go for the Palestinian cause. Urging the adoption of the resolution, he stated: "If we run the risk of seeing the United Nations break down, or of causing the Program of Action of the Decade to fail, we assume our responsibility, because rather than seeing the UN survive bogged down in compromise, we prefer to see the UN dead to see it break down for having defended and brought about the triumph of truth and justice." The delegate of Iran, which voted for the resolution, frankly admitted that the term Zionism "may be interpreted in different ways and is not very clear to us in the context of this draft resolution." Nevertheless, his country had acted "out of a spirit of solidarity with our Arab brothers."

The Israeli and United States delegates delivered the principal opposition speeches, but all West European and several Latin American and African delegates, as well as one Asian, Fiji, also spoke against the resolution. Israel's Chaim Herzog argued that Zionism was the national liberation movement of the Jewish people and was recognized as such as far back as 1947 in a historic speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in the UN; that the unbroken connection of the Jewish people with the land of Israel went back to biblical times, a fact acknowledged by the League of Nations and the UN; that in the guise of anti-Zionism, Resolution 3379 was an antisemitic attack on the Jewish people and their religion; that its purpose was to deny the Jewish people what the UN Charter purported to grant, namely, the right to national self-determination, now being enjoyed by the "Arab nation" in 20 sovereign states occupying 4.5 million square miles with immense riches; that Arabs in Israel had complete equality and more freedom than did Arabs elsewhere; that the real racists were the Arab states, which had expelled and confiscated the property of 800,000 Jews who had lived there for 2,000 years. Herzog further drew attention to the plight of the Kurds in Iraq, the Christians in Lebanon, and other minorities in Arab states. Having opened his address with a moving evocation of the 1938 *Kristallnacht* in Nazi Germany, which step-by-step led to the death camps—and to which he likened the Zionism resolution—he closed with a gesture of defiance and contempt by dramatically ripping the text of the resolution.

Moynihan charged that the resolution projected a "political lie of a variety well known to the 20th century," that it constituted "a massive attack on the moral realities of the world." The term racism (in contrast to the term racial discrimination), he pointed out, had never been legally defined by any UN body. It had been associated in both popular and scientific usage with invidious discrimination based on a belief in innate and unchangeable genetic differences. Zionism, he said, was rather a political-religious movement that rejected this thesis. Israel's population

was in fact drawn from diverse racial stocks—black, brown, white, oriental, and Western—and large numbers were non-Jews, including Muslims and Christians of Arab and other national origins. Many of its non-Jewish inhabitants were citizens, and those who were not could acquire citizenship by legal procedures very much like those in Western Europe.

Racism in the sense of belief in a hierarchy of rights based on innate differences among people, Moynihan argued, was altogether alien to Zionism, a political and religious movement that was part of a “general upsurge of national consciousness and aspiration that overtook most other people after 1848, and that in time spread to all of Africa and Asia.” The very idea of the Jews constituting a “race” was invented by 19th-century antisemites to replace the old religious grounds for antisemitism, which had begun to lose force.

He further asserted that among the “terrible consequences” of the adoption of a resolution which, in the words of Andrei Sakharov, gave the “appearance of international sanction” to the “abomination of antisemitism” would be the discrediting of UN efforts against racism. By today perverting the meaning of racism and tomorrow other terms in the human rights lexicon, it could irreversibly damage the very idea of human rights. Moynihan concluded with a ringing statement that his country “will not abide by, will not acquiesce in this infamous act.”

Other opposition speakers argued that the resolution was confusing and imprecise (Canada, France); that no case had been made to support the contention that Zionism was tantamount to racism (Barbados); that the purported anticolonialists were, in fact, attacking the world’s oldest national liberation movement; that to equate Zionism with racism was to confuse racism with nationalism; that the resolution was an invitation to genocide against the Jews (Costa Rica); that it did not further the cause of eradicating racism to introduce the specific problems of the Middle East into the the deliberations on that topic (Austria); that it was wrong to stigmatize one party to what essentially was a boundary dispute as being colonialist and racist (Haiti); that *apartheid* and Zionism had different histories and perspectives (Ethiopia); that the governments of the EEC countries categorically rejected the concept that Zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination (Italy); that the term “black Zionism” had been used in a positive sense in West Africa “to denote the movement to return to Africa the displaced Africans uprooted from their homelands and sold into slavery in the western world” (Sierra Leone); that the OAU action at Kampala had not been unanimous (Liberia); that the resolution would divert the Decade Against Racism from its intended focus on Southern Africa, reduce support for it and the UN, and would encourage the very evil it was intended to eradicate (Barbados, Liberia, Zambia); that the Zionism resolution would exacerbate religious animosities in many parts of the world (Australia); that the UN should seek to harmonize and not exacerbate differences; that many countries suffered from some form or degree of racial discrimination and that it was therefore unfair to single out one particular country (Fiji).

The West European delegates gave one or more of these reasons for voting against

the Zionism resolution, as well as against the two other resolutions offered under the same agenda item: on the Decade Against Racism and the world conference against racism projected for 1977. Like the United States, they stated that they would not cooperate with the Decade and would not help finance the world conference.

On the day after the vote, reporters asked delegates why they voted for the resolution. The *New York Times* (November 12, 1975) enumerated the various reasons given: Arab oil and other Arab political pressures; pressure of membership in the Islamic Conference (Iran); Arab propaganda and effective lobbying by Palestinian and Moslem representatives in Latin America and in the UN; spillover from the anti-American pique of some Latin American and other Third World countries; role of Arab extremists and Cuban guerrilla specialists who had latched on to anticolonialist liberation movements in Africa; actual belief of some new black African governments that Zionism, capitalism, and American imperialism were all faces of the "same monster."

Governmental and Public Reactions

The Assembly's action evoked an unprecedented flood of protests from the United States government, political parties, citizens' groups, the press, artists, scientists, and intellectuals throughout the United States.⁷ Jointly and separately, international Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) accredited to the UN issued statements of criticism.

UN-ACCREDITED NGOS AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

In a joint declaration issued after the Third Committee vote (October 30), over 60 representatives and observers of UN-accredited international and national NGOs deplored the resolution "as a perversion of historical and contemporary fact, as unrepresentative of the decent opinion of mankind . . . harmful to the effectiveness of the important world struggle against racial discrimination, including apartheid," and "a means to incite racist hatred—anti-Semitism—against Jews and Jewish communities whose sympathies lie with the State of Israel."

On the same day, the International Commission of Jurists stated that the resolution exemplified a tendency to disregard juridical norms in UN initiatives; it was adopted without defining Zionism and without study by any UN organ of the various meanings attributed to the term. The State of Israel, it said, was established and recognized by the UN as a legitimate expression of the aspiration to national liberation and statehood of the great majority of the Jewish people after having experienced unspeakable racial persecution during World War II. Therefore, the

⁷See pp. 147–48 for the reaction of the Jewish community. For reactions abroad, see pertinent chapters in the reviews of the various countries; Mexico is discussed in a section below.

Commission declared, "to categorize Zionism as racism is to equate nationalism with racism." At the same time, it held that it was erroneous to denounce opposition to Zionist aspirations as antisemitism.

The International League for the Rights of Man, in an open letter of November 21 to UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, stated: "Our concern for the human rights efforts of the UN, including its responsibilities in the Middle East conflict, prompts us to express our dismay over this unwarranted resolution and to hope that it will be treated with the minimal attention it deserves."

U.S. GOVERNMENT: FEDERAL AND LOCAL

Congress reacted with speed and anger. Many members of both Houses condemned the resolution and called for retaliatory action through total or partial withholding of funds or of participation in the UN, e.g., Senators James D. Allan (D., Ala.), Richard Stone (D., Fla.), and Lloyd M. Bentsen (D., Tex.); Representative Lester L. Wolff (D., Nassau Co.). Others urged serious review of the United States commitment to the UN and of the UN's voting system and structure, e.g., Senators J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (R., Md.), Hiram L. Fong (R., Hawaii), Harrison Williams, Jr. (D., N.J.), Charles McC. Mathias (R., Md.), and Robert Taft, Jr. (R., O.). Others, while condemning the resolution, opposed withdrawal from the UN and cautioned against precipitous action: Senators Joseph P. Biden, Jr. (D., Del.), Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.), Charles H. Percy (R., Ill.), and Representative Jonathan B. Bingham (D., N.Y.). Senator Humphrey pointed out that many Africans had voted against the resolution, and a small shift in the vote could have defeated it. Senator Percy observed that United States withdrawal would leave no one to explain America's policies, or to speak for Israel.

On November 11 both Houses of Congress unanimously adopted resolutions denouncing the Assembly's action as "contributing to anti-Semitism," opposing United States participation in the Decade, and calling on the General Assembly to rescind Resolution 3379. The Senate urged immediate hearings by its Foreign Relations Committee and by the House Committee on International Relations to "reassess the United States' participation in the UN General Assembly."⁸

The administration also reacted quickly, though with more restraint. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger declared on November 11 that "the United States will ignore this vote and pay no attention to it;" that the UN "will damage itself if it continues in this way." A day later, he called it "extremely unhelpful and highly irresponsible," and adding to existing "tensions and rifts and . . . distrust." This, he said, might lead to a breakdown in efforts recently initiated by the United States in the UN for long-term economic cooperation with Third World countries. At the same time, he reminded critics of the resolution that the Security Council served

⁸*Congressional Record*, November 11, 1975, pp. S 19591; H 10911.

the useful purpose of cooling off passions and the United States had more to gain from staying in the Assembly than from withdrawing; that whatever the immediate irritations, we must retain the possibility of cooperation; that many African states were trying to act responsibly, and that, having in the past overrated the UN's values, we should not now go "to the other extreme of not realizing some of the benefits that the United Nations with all its failings still has for the United States." On November 13 President Gerald R. Ford stated that he did not intend to reduce the size of his request to Congress for the United States share of the UN budget.

The resolution was condemned by the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on the United Nations, the Massachusetts senate, the Detroit and Los Angeles city councils, the Baltimore County executive, and other state and local legislative bodies in the United States.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

On December 12 the quasi-official U.S. National Commission for UNESCO warned that the resolution might "encourage anti-Semitism which is itself a form of racial discrimination as that term is defined in Article I" of the Convention on Racial Discrimination. It viewed "with alarm" the existing situation at the UN, where so many nations were demonstrably ready "to pervert long-standing concepts of human rights for temporary political advantage."

The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, in a statement on November 19, denounced the resolution as "divisive" and recalled the "long, positive and continuing association" between Israel and UNICEF. The board of directors of the United Nations Association—USA, on November 21, urged the United States government to lead efforts to prevent a repetition of such actions in the UN and other international forums, and recommended nonsupport of the Decade and other UN programs which attempt to implement the resolution, as well as official expression of displeasure with governments that voted for it.

A group of 55 distinguished United States intellectuals, academicians, and Nobel Laureates issued a protest statement on November 10, which read: "The UN resolution against racism, in its present form, may well inflame racial hatred and legitimize antisemitism on an international scale. It is a disruptive and subversive measure aimed at reducing the Jewish people to pariah status, as part of the Arab states' campaign to destroy the State of Israel."⁹ The National Education Association called for repeal of the resolution as departing from UN ideals. The president of the League of Women Voters addressed a letter to President Ford, Secretary Kissinger and other foreign policy leaders saying that "Recent events have caused many of our members to question their long-time support [of the UN]."¹⁰

Leaders of national ethnic and minority organizations, meeting in Chicago on

⁹Initiated by Professors for Peace in the Middle East Ad Hoc Protest Committee; see *APPME Bulletin*, November 1975.

¹⁰*New York Times*, November 14, 1975.

November 26, issued a statement charging that the resolution "denies to the Jewish people the same right of self-determination that is accorded to other peoples. To equate Zionism, a humanitarian movement, with racism is both a blatant lie and an insult to Americans whose ethnic and racial backgrounds make them sensitive to all forms of bigotry." The statement, read to a rally of 10,000 in Chicago by Aloysius A. Mazewski, national president of the Polish American Congress and a delegate to the UN, was signed by representatives of Greek, Lithuanian, Hispanic, Black, Irish-American, Belgian, Chinese, Italian, Swedish, Japanese, Ukrainian, and other groups.

The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, at its meeting in Atlanta in August 1976, resolved that it "rejects categorically and specifically the legal basis for and assertion by" the Zionism Resolution and "deplores the appeal inherent in said Resolution to the basest of human frailties (anti-Semitism) rather than moving to co-exist on the basis of mutual respect consistent with the world rule of law." The report accompanying the ABA resolution stated in part: "The United Nations resolution necessarily evinces a commitment to the destruction of the modern state of Israel as a homeland of the Jewish people and is therefore incompatible with the United Nations Charter and with international law."

CHRISTIAN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Numerous Christian bodies and leaders, both Protestant and Catholic—including many normally neutral in regard to Middle East issues, or even critical of Israel—joined in the attack on the Zionism resolution. Dr. Philip A. Potter, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, declared his organization's "unequivocal opposition to the equation of Zionism with racism." Zionism, he stated, did not fall under the commonly understood meaning of racism, which UNESCO's 1967 Statement on Race defined as discriminatory beliefs or acts justified on grounds of "immutable and innate" characteristics. Maintaining that the resolution exacerbated the explosive conflict in the Middle East by diverting attention from the task of resolving it through peaceful negotiation, he called on the General Assembly to "reconsider and rescind" it.¹¹

Dr. Robert V. Moss, president of the United Church of Christ, declared: "We should not be deceived by the use of the term Zionism. The sponsors of the resolution meant by it Jews and Judaism as well as the state of Israel."¹²

The United Church Board for World Ministries condemned the resolution as an "ill-advised propaganda device," and rejected its method of "voicing opposition to Israel's policies and unwillingness to comply with UN resolutions on the Middle East."¹³ At the same time, such groups as the Council of Bishops of the United

¹¹*Religious News Service*, November 11, 1975.

¹²*Ibid.*

¹³*Ibid.*, November 24, 1975.

Methodist Church expressed concern over the potential loss of support for the UN as a consequence of the resolution.¹⁴

Sixty Catholic and Protestant church leaders from 21 states, participating in an interfaith workshop in Memphis, Tenn., sent to the UN Secretary-General a sharply critical statement calling the resolution "a revival of the all too familiar anti-Semitism which has plagued mankind through the centuries. It is, moreover, a falsehood without historical justification."¹⁵

In "A Statement of Conscience on Zionism and Racism," 21 Christian religious leaders in California declared: "It is ironic that those nations that are spearheading this anti-Zionist campaign are themselves the product of national liberation movements. They are denying to the Jewish people the fundamental right of national self-determination which they claim for themselves."¹⁶

The leaders of the Catholic Church were particularly outspoken. John Cardinal Krol, Archbishop of Philadelphia, commented in a November 13 address at St. Joseph's College that "all reasonable people realize that facts are not determined by majority vote and that unsupported charges discredit the majority and not the target of their charges." John Cardinal Cransberry of St. Louis called the vote "regrettable" and "distressing," a "reckless statement" by the General Assembly that was "a far cry from the high ideals expected by John XXIII."¹⁷ Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, deplored the resolution in a public statement as opening the door "to harassment, discrimination and denial of basic rights to members of the Jewish community throughout the world."¹⁸

There were statements also by Archbishop Thomas A. Donnellan of Atlanta, who, at a conference commemorating the tenth anniversary of Vatican II, denounced the resolution as "not in accord with the facts and [is] productive of much harm,"¹⁹ and by Archbishop Peter L. Gerety of Newark who condemned it as an "abhorrent action" and an "outrage."²⁰

Both the National Catholic Conference of Interracial Justice and the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights characterized the resolution as an expression of antisemitism.²¹ The Catholic Interracial Council of New York recognized "Zionism itself as part of the long fight against racism" and observed that, therefore, "to seek to enlist the UN in a global campaign against Zionism as a form of racism is not only to distort the truth, but it is a means likely to incite racist hatred and

¹⁴*Ibid.*, November 20, 1975.

¹⁵*New York Times*, November 9, 1975.

¹⁶*Los Angeles Times*, November 5, 1975.

¹⁷*Religious News Service*, November 17, 1975.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, November 12, 1975.

¹⁹*Atlanta Constitution*, October 25, 1975.

²⁰*Newark Star Ledger*, November 16, 1975.

²¹*Religious News Service*, November 13, 1975.

antisemitism against Jews and other groups whose sympathies lie with the State of Israel."²²

Condemnation of the resolution by the Catholic press, particularly the diocesan weeklies, was prompt and strong: the *Criterion* in Indianapolis said, "We were wrong. Accolades for a tyrannical buffoon are small potatoes compared with the attack this week on Israel and Jews everywhere who see Israel as their spiritual homeland;" the *Monitor* in San Francisco called November 10 "a day of shame;" the *Voice* of Miami maintained, "It is those who voted in bad conscience for the resolution who are racists;" the *Catholic Free Press* in Worcester, Mass., commented that "in the context of the UN mentality today, a slur upon Zionism is an attack against Judaism."²³

Independent Christian publications were equally outspoken. *Christianity Today* stated: "If religious considerations are part of the indictment in the Committee's resolution, it is only fair to observe that in this area Judaism is no match for Islam and its strictures against non-Muslims. Muslims who have converted to Christianity can tell the world of the social, economic and political sanctions that follow as a matter of course. For the Arabs to press this line tells us more about them than about the State of Israel;" or the Kansas City *National Catholic Reporter*: "By equating Zionism with racism, the UN is transformed from an arena for serious debate into a collection of nationally and ideologically labeled soapboxes for declamation, not dialogue;" and the Baltimore *Catholic Review*: "The UN resolution on Zionism is so absurd, it is tempting to write it off as a clownish prank of an adolescent mob. Unfortunately anti-Semitism is too serious an evil for anyone—especially Christians—to ignore the resolution."²⁴

Greek Orthodox Archbishop Iakovos attacked the vote as "deplorable and offensive."²⁵

THE PRESS

The resolution was overwhelmingly denounced in columns, editorials, letters-to-the-editor, and advertisements in newspapers throughout the United States. An Anti-Defamation League survey²⁶ of 50 top-circulation newspapers showed that 34 (68 per cent) viewed the resolution as tantamount to antisemitism; 3 (6 per cent) opposed it, but did not regard it as antisemitism, and 13 (26 per cent) did not touch on the antisemitism question.

The New York *Times* condemned the resolution in editorials entitled "Cynical

²²*Ibid.*, November 13, 1975.

²³*Ibid.*, November 17, 1975.

²⁴*Ibid.*, November 17, 1975.

²⁵*News Release*, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, December 10, 1975.

²⁶Memorandum of November 26, 1975.

Diplomacy" (October 24, 1975), and "Shame of the UN" (November 13, 1975); the *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 17, 1975) in one headed "The Hypocrites in the Woodwork." The *Washington Post* expressed the opinion that the resolution blessed "every wayward international impulse to undermine Israel and to hate Jews." The Chicago *Daily News* noted the "philosophical kinship" between anti-Zionism at the UN and Nazism. The Los Angeles *Times* observed that while to be anti-Zionist is not necessarily to be antisemitic, "the resolution was bad business" and "belies the integrity of those Arab states that protest their willingness to co-exist with Israel." The Portland *Oregonian* spoke of "Jew-baiting" in the Assembly. The Seattle *Times* commented on the irony that a generation after Hitler, "the UN itself would officially indorse anti-semitism."²⁷ Among other critics were the *Richmond News Leader* (November 13), *Monitor of Concord, N.H.* (November 12), the *Indianapolis News* (November 12), and the Syracuse *Herald-Journal* (November 12).

A strong statement came from Lewis H. Lapham, editor of *Harper's*:

Intended as an attack against Israel (and by extension against the ideas associated with democracy, civil liberties, and human rights), the resolution encourages the member states to look upon support for Israel as a criminal act. If enforced by literal-minded governments . . . the resolution could transform anti-Semitism into a noble cause. . . . The cheering that accompanied the counting of the votes in the General Assembly contained the mockery of self-defeat. Once conceived as the last, best hope of peace in the world, the U.N. appeared to have changed itself into a headquarters tent convenient for plotting wars. ²⁸

At the same time, though to a far lesser extent, some newspapers carried items defending or explaining the resolution. Terence Smith of the *New York Times* (November 16, 1975), while dissenting from the resolution, cited evidences of legal and factual discrimination against Arabs in Israel, but also noted that they were much better off than Arabs in certain other Middle East countries. An Arab League-sponsored advertisement, reproducing a letter of Elmer Berger, the anti-Zionist ideologist and cofounder of the American Council for Judaism, charged that Israel was indeed a racist state in that Jews were accorded a status superior to that of others in the society as a matter of public law.²⁹

M. T. Mehdi, secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, contended that though Zionism had arisen as a response to antisemitism and racism, it had itself evolved into a racist movement by claiming for Jews rights denied to others. It had occupied and established in Palestine a Jewish state "against the will of the people of Palestine."³⁰ A paid advertisement in the *Providence Journal* of January 6, 1976, signed by a group of persons of Arab descent and others, denied

²⁷Anti-Defamation League Press Release, December 2, 1975.

²⁸*Harper's*, January 1976, p. 39.

²⁹*New York Times*, November 23, 1975.

³⁰Letter to the editor, *ibid.*, November 25, 1975.

that anti-Zionists were antisemities and repeated the litany of Arab charges against Israel.

I. F. Stone found truth in the arguments of both the critics and the defenders of the resolution. While agreeing that the sponsors were hypocritical in that many were themselves guilty of discrimination,³¹ he believed that Arabs did have legitimate grievances against Israel.

BLACK COMMUNITY

Spokesmen for the black community, too, condemned the Zionism resolution as antisemitic as well as harmful to the UN drive against racism.

Before and after the Third Committee vote, Black Americans to Support Israel Committee (BASIC), headed by A. Philip Randolph, sent statements to all African delegations to the UN, which said, in part: "Condemning Zionism as racist will sow a harvest of bitterness, turmoil, and divisiveness that can only confuse the battle against racism and apartheid. . . The attempt to label Zionism as a form of racism obscures the roots and nature of racism. The fight against racism will not be advanced by the sanctioning, however indirect or tacit, of anti-semitism. . . ."³² The organization inserted a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* (November 23, 1975), with a quotation from a column by Bayard Rustin, which said: "Zionism is not racism, but the legitimate expression of the Jewish people's self-determination.

. From our 400 years experience with slavery, segregation, and discrimination, we know that Zionism is not racism." Among other black groups expressing such sentiments were 28 American scholars, educators, and other intellectual leaders, including C. Clyde Ferguson of Harvard Law School; Charles H. Wesley, former director of the Afro-American Museum in Philadelphia, and Luther Foster, president of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, who appealed to the General Assembly on November 8 to set aside the Zionist resolution because "concern for [its] anti-Semitic implications . . . will heavily compromise African hopes of expunging apartheid from the world conscience."³³

Vernon E. Jordan, executive director of the National Urban League, in his syndicated column, said the UN action reminded him of the League of Nations, which became irrelevant when, in the case of Ethiopia, it "refused to stand up to protect the integrity of small countries." He saw a parallel between the code words "forced busing" and "law and order," which were used to victimize blacks, and "Zionism," a code word for antisemitism.³⁴ Dr. Thomas W. Matthew, president of the black self-help organization NEGRO, declared, ". . . Zionism is not racism just as Black Power is not racism—both are self-help movements invented by peoples who are

³¹Op Ed column, *ibid.*, November 23, 1975.

³²BASIC release, n.d.

³³*New York Times*, December 8, 1975.

³⁴Reported in *Religious News Service*, November 19, 1975.

victims of long standing oppression. ³⁵ Manhattan Borough President Percy Sutton joined with the four other borough presidents of New York in condemning the Zionism resolution as "a blatant power play on the part of some Arab nations" whose passage would kick off a "new era of antisemitism."³⁶

LABOR

Illustrative of organized labor's view on the Zionism resolution was a statement issued by AFL-CIO President George Meany on October 31:

The American people will not be fooled by a resolution which absurdly asked the U.N. to declare "that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination." Zionism is not; it is precisely the product of revulsion against these evils, especially as they reached their culmination in the holocaust of Adolph Hitler, for whom some of the promoters of this resolution can scarcely conceal their admiration. The resolution is all the more ludicrous in light of the persecution of religious and national minorities rampant in the lands of its sponsors. Let those sponsors look to the plight of Jews in Syria, of the Kurds in Iraq, of the Christians in Lebanon and southern Sudan—not to mention the attempted wholesale liquidation of national minorities in the Soviet Union.

But the real struggle that must be waged against racism on a global scale can only be weakened and disoriented when the term racism itself loses meaning, falling victim to ideological warfare. The Third Committee's resolution will not advance the struggle against racism but set it back.

Popular support for the U.N. is eroding in the United States. In the view of the AFL-CIO, which represents a massive cross-section of the American people, the General Assembly must defeat the resolution on Zionism or gravely jeopardize United States participation in the United Nations.

On November 3, 1975, Harry Van Arsdale, president of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, presented to the United States Mission to the UN on behalf of the top officials of 20 affiliates a statement attacking the Third Committee's anti-Zionism resolution and saluting Ambassador Moynihan for his role in fighting it. Excoriating the UN as "the sinkhole" with "113 dictatorships and totalitarian regimes [that] far outnumber the two dozen remaining democracies," the statement continued: "How dare the majority in the UN condemn Zionism as racism when they know that in Israel every resident, of every race, color and creed has equal rights as a citizen of the state? Isn't it hypocrisy when Africans surrender to Arab oil blackmail and kiss the feet of those who sold them into slavery? It wasn't the Americans or the Jews who started the African slave trade; it was these same Arab potentates."³⁷ The executive board

³⁵New York *Amsterdam News*, November 12, 1975.

³⁶*Ibid.*, November 19, 1975.

³⁷*Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, November 4, 1975.

of the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO, condemned the resolution as an "affront to the Jewish people who have been history's primary victims of racism."³⁸

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

A Harris poll taken in mid-December examined the attitudes of the American people toward the Zionism resolution. According to the findings, 49 per cent disapproved of it, 9 per cent approved, and 42 per cent were not sure. The percentages were about the same as those for and against the Israeli or Arab causes, indicated by public opinion polls for some years. Significantly, however, while a large majority opposed having the United States "take itself out of the United Nations now," 49 against 24 per cent approved reducing the United States contribution to the UN, and 43 against 26 per cent were in favor of putting the UN on notice that the Americans would pull out "if such prejudice is shown in the future."³⁹

Mexico, Zionism Resolution, and IWY

Held in Mexico City in June 1975, the International Women's Year Conference adopted the "Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Peace, 1975," a world plan of action for the advancement of women, and 34 separate resolutions on many subjects, including the rights of the Palestinians.⁴⁰ Israel and Zionism were violently attacked by conference speakers and in the Declaration and resolutions. One of the paragraphs in the Declaration stated that "international cooperation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, Zionism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination in all its forms as well as the recognition of peoples and their rights to self-determination." An Israeli amendment to delete the mention of Zionism was rejected, and the Declaration was adopted by a vote of 89 in favor, three against (Denmark, Israel, and the United States), with 18 abstentions.

The conference also adopted a resolution on Palestinian women, appealing to all states and international organizations "to extend assistance to the Palestinian and Arab women and people in their struggle against Zionism, foreign occupation and alien domination, foreign aggression, and help them restore their inalienable rights in Palestine . . ." (66 to three—Israel, Netherlands, and the United States—with 35 abstentions). The United States representative stated (July 2) that "References to 'Zionism' appear to associate this conference with a campaign against the State of Israel, and carry the implication that the State of Israel should be eliminated. The

³⁸*Ibid.*, November 21, 1975.

³⁹Louis Harris and Associates release, December 15, 1975.

⁴⁰UN Press Release round-up, IWY/68 and 69, July 3, 1975.

United States strongly opposes any provisions of this nature directed against one member of the United Nations."⁴¹

Mexico's support of the Zionism resolution⁴² in the General Assembly resulted in a precipitous drop in organized and individual tourism by American Jews. This, in turn, produced heavy pressure on the Mexican government from local business interests to reach an accommodation with Israel and American Jewish organizations. Mexican President Luis Echeverria commissioned former President Miguel Alemán, newly appointed president of the Mexican Tourist Council, to fly to New York (November 25) to extend to leaders of the major Jewish organizations an invitation to fly to Mexico City for a meeting with Echeverria. Early in December Echeverria sent Mexican Foreign Minister Emilio Rabasa to Israel to placate its leaders. After meeting with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Foreign Minister Yigal Allon, Rabasa issued a public statement in Israel saying that Mexico considered Zionism "honorable." He stated that, as host country to the International Women's Year world conference, Mexico would have to vote in the General Assembly in favor of the conference Declaration and resolutions, which contained offensive references to Israel and Zionism, but that Mexico would use that occasion to correct the impression that it was anti-Zionist. Allon expressed satisfaction with this "retraction."

American Jewish leaders met with Echeverria in Mexico City on December 12, at which time he declared that Zionism and racism could not be equated, and promised that Mexico would not again vote in the UN in a manner that could be construed as anti-Zionist. He said Rabasa was flying directly from Israel to the UN General Assembly to instruct Mexico's representative to cast its affirmative vote in a way that would "distinguish our Third World policy from anything which might even resemble anti-Zionism." He said: . . . we are not anti-Zionist. We understand the historical and honorable meaning of Zionism. He in no way identifies Zionism with racism and the votes of his delegation at the United Nations were not intended to convey that impression." He had taken steps "to insure that future votes by Mexico cannot be interpreted or misunderstood as equating Zionism with racism."⁴³

The results of the IWY conference—the Declaration of Mexico, the Plan of Action, and the several Conference resolutions—were approved by the General Assembly's plenary in a series of separate resolutions. One of these, Resolution 3519, on "Women's Participation . . . in the struggle against colonialism, racial discrimina-

⁴¹*Department of State Bulletin*, August 18, 1975.

⁴²Among various reasons given for this were: extensive Arab propaganda activity; anticipated commercial relationships with the Arab countries; aspiration to a position of leadership in the Third World and to a role as its link with the industrialized countries, and the Mexican president's rumored ambition to succeed Secretary-General Waldheim or to head some kind of new Third World organization.

⁴³Transcript of minutes.

tion, . . .” was adopted by 90 to 21, with 22 abstentions. A second, Resolution 3520, on a “World Conference of the International Women’s Year,” was adopted 107 to one (Israel), with 26 abstentions.

In the debate in the Third Committee on these resolutions, Western delegations repeated their objections to the inclusion of extraneous political matters, in particular the references to Zionism. The United States delegate said: “Although the Mexico City Conference had its constructive aspects, it had also its negative ones. . . . the United States had objected to the references to Zionism in the Declaration of Mexico and to the wording of a few of the resolutions adopted at the Conference. . . .”⁴⁴

These arguments were repeated in the plenary. Libya stated: “The inclusion of Zionism in the Declaration of Mexico was proof of its importance.” Syria understood resolution 3519 to equate Zionism with racism. Iran “regretted that certain phrases were included in the Declaration of Mexico which were out of place,” but considered that the “Declaration did contain important principles.” The United States strongly objected to “the efforts of some to politicize the World Conference” and “to the reference to Zionism in the Declaration of Mexico and to the wording of a few of the resolutions of the Conference.” Canada reaffirmed its total rejection of the reference to Zionism in the Declaration and to certain of the resolutions. The EEC states declared they considered Resolution 3519 a “manifesto containing political propaganda.” Venezuela explained that its affirmative vote on all the resolutions should not be interpreted as being against the State of Israel or its practices. Mexico said the “reservations certain delegates had about the decisions of the Mexico Conference should not be an obstacle to voting in favor of the draft. Mexico was a co-sponsor of the draft, but that did not mean that it unconditionally accepted all the words used in the decisions of the Conference.”⁴⁵

In explaining Mexico’s vote in favor of one of the resolutions, its delegate said (December 15): “If we mean by Zionism the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish people, within the terms of the UN Charter, our vote should not be interpreted as acceptance of the equation of Zionism with colonialism and apartheid, which Mexico has already condemned.”

Ambassador Herzog, who had not been informed of Allon’s understanding with Rabasa, criticized the statement. However, the Israel government issued a conciliatory statement which, recalling Rabasa’s promise, hoped that Mexico would keep its promise in voting on the subject of Zionism in UNESCO and in other international organizations, which were expected soon. The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, on the other hand, issued a statement on December 16 which said it was “deeply disturbed by the failure of Mexico’s representative . . . to make clear the position conveyed to Jewish leadership last week by the President of Mexico” and urged Echeverria “to direct the representatives of his

⁴⁴A/C.3/Sr.2176, p. 13.

⁴⁵Press Release, GA/SHC/2015 and 2016, December 3, 1975.

government to reflect and demonstrate the understanding and sympathy he displayed in their meeting in all future votes.”

Subsequently, Mexico's posture on Zionism and on Israel-Arab questions vacillated. Though it absented itself from the voting on resolutions at the meetings in December of UNESCO and the International Civil Aviation Organization, in both of which the Arabs requested the incorporation by reference of the Zionism resolution, it continued to curry favor with the Arabs, voting with them in various UN bodies and agencies. Mexico went out of its way to demonstrate this support when it sent a gratuitous letter to the President of the Security Council which was considering the OAU complaint of Israeli aggression against Uganda in connection with the Entebbe incident.⁴⁶ Though the letter condemned “all terrorist acts” and the hijacking “by an extremist Palestinian group,” and affirmed “the right of each of the States of the region to live in peace and security,” it was implicitly critical of Israel's rescue operation and defensive of the PLO.

The Aftermath

It was evident that the anti-Zionist campaign in the UN was continuing and that, as an Arab League spokesman predicted, Resolution 3379 was being exploited for this purpose.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

At the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) conference in Rome in November 1975, Iraq and Libya called for the expulsion of Israel as a racist state and, as noted in the final report of the Conference, “several delegates” cited the anti-Zionism resolution in urging that food aid should go to liberation movements—implicitly including the PLO—struggling against foreign domination and racism. The Western participants objected, and United States delegate Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz warned that the politicization of the FAO was eroding American support for the organization.

UNESCO

In December in Paris, at a UNESCO-sponsored conference of governmental experts mandated to define the role of the mass media in combating war propaganda, racism, and *apartheid*, Yugoslavia, acting for the Arab participants, proposed an amendment to the conference draft declaration which contained a reference Resolution 3379. When the amendment was approved by a vote of 36 to 22, with seven abstentions, the nine states of the European Economic Community (EEC), Aus-

⁴⁶S/12135. Since Mexico was not a member of the Security Council, it had no need to place itself on record.

tralia, Canada and the United States walked out. Before withdrawing, the United States delegate declared: "... we oppose any text which directly or indirectly equates racism with Zionism ... we condemn the evils of racism as it is traditionally understood. We will not condemn Zionism and will not participate in an Orwellian distortion of those terms."

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

At the 32nd session of the Commission on Human Rights, February 2-March 5, 1976, the Arab and Communist states secured the adoption of a resolution (No. 9) containing provisions which, though couched in general terms, were understood to be aimed at the Zionism resolution. It requested the Sub-Commission on Discrimination and Minorities at its next session to "prepare suggestions on effective ways and means and concrete measures for securing the full and universal implementation of the United Nations resolutions and decisions on racism, racial discrimination ... and related matters and to submit its suggestions and proposals to the commission at its thirty-third session." This resolution drew the Sub-Commission's attention specifically to "the deliberations and decisions of the General Assembly at its thirtieth session ... " wording designed to incorporate indirectly the Zionism resolution.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 19 to eight, with one abstention. The United States refused to participate in the vote. The United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of France, Italy, and the Federal Republic of Germany, explained that they opposed the resolution because it contained a disguised reference to Assembly Resolution 3379, against which they had voted. Jordan said the resolution provided an opportunity to establish once and for all that racial discrimination did exist in Israel, and that it was appropriate for the Assembly to have equated Zionism with racism.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

When the 60th session of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), April 13-May 14, 1976,⁴⁷ discussed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination the Arabs again used the occasion to inject the Zionism issue by indirection. One of the resolutions related to the Secretary-General's report of progress of activities by UN bodies, governments, and nongovernmental organizations.

On the motion of the Arab members, ECOSOC had added language welcoming adoption by the Assembly and other UN bodies and agencies of "resolutions and/or measures bearing on racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, decolonization and self-determination called for under the Programme of the Decade," and urging all

⁴⁷Press Release, ECOSOC/3895, May 14, 1976.

states "to cooperate loyally and fully in achieving the goals and objectives of the Decade." Another resolution dealt with Ghana's offer to host the world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination, intended as a major feature of the Decade. This resolution contained a paragraph asking the General Assembly to establish as the purpose of the conference "to mobilize world opinion and adopt measures likely to secure the full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions on racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, decolonization and self-determination." The radical Arabs failed to get the necessary support for the inclusion of explicit references to the Zionism resolution. Nonetheless, United States, Canada, the EEC states, and several Third-World states opposed both resolutions as tainted by the indirect link to the Zionism resolution.

The resolutions were approved by votes of 40 to one (Canada), with nine and eight abstentions, respectively. The United States declined to participate in the vote. The Arabs, however, declared that they indeed interpreted the wording as encompassing the Zionism resolution, and would so insist in the 1976 General Assembly session.

During the debate, William Scranton, who succeeded Moynihan as U.S. Ambassador to the UN, made a special appearance to present the United States position on the Zionism resolution:

It [zionism] was a justifiable and understandable manifestation of national feeling on the part of a people whose claim to a homeland had been recognized by the United Nations almost 30 years ago. . . The United States would never accept the thesis of General Assembly resolution 3379 (xxx) any more than it would agree that other legitimate national movements were to be condemned as forms of racism or racial discrimination. That policy was not the policy of a particular Administration at a particular moment; it was a view strongly held in the Congress, in the Executive Branch and throughout the nation as a whole. The United States felt so strongly about the Assembly resolution that it had announced that it could no longer participate in the Decade . . . or support it or attend the proposed Conference in Ghana. It would adhere to that position and could resume its participation in the Decade only if the latter were to return to its original basis, which had once been accepted by a broad consensus.⁴⁸

The publicized visit of South African Prime Minister John Vorster to Israel while ECOSOC was in session gave the Arab members additional ammunition. Democratic Yemen, for example, observed that discrimination against the Palestinians and Africans could not be separated; that the Vorster visit highlighted the traditional ties and the unholy alliance between the two countries; that agreements on economic and scientific cooperation signed during Vorster's visit reflected the determination of both governments to carry out policies of racial discrimination. He suggested that the General Assembly adopt punitive measures against governments practicing racial discrimination.

The PLO observer spoke of a "Praetoria-Tel Aviv axis." The Soviet Union, commenting that Vorster had been welcomed in Israel with "open arms," also spoke

⁴⁸Press Release ECOSOC/3844, April 28, 1976.

of the "unholy alliance between Praetoria and Tel Aviv." The Byelorussian SSR observer said that despite attempts by several countries to conceal the fact that Zionism was racist, Vorster's recent visit to Israel was proof of that fact. He added: "The Zionist ideology, recently restated at the World Zionist Congress, was in clear violation of Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination." Cuba said that Vorster's visit proved that the Zionism resolution was justified. The Syrian delegate stated that the growing "collaboration between Praetoria and Tel Aviv" was endangering UN efforts against racial discrimination and drew attention to the concern expressed by the chairman of the General Assembly's Special Committee Against Apartheid over Israel's collaboration with South Africa in defiance of UN resolutions.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID

At a meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which coincided with both the Vorster visit and the ECOSOC meeting, the Arab League observer urged all UN bodies to condemn the Israel-South Africa collaboration. Sudan proposed that the Apartheid Committee make a detailed study of this collaboration and submit it to the General Assembly, together with recommendations of ways and means to eliminate racism in South Africa and Israel. The Committee requested that its Subcommittee on the Implementation of UN Resolutions and Collaboration with South Africa prepare, on a priority basis, a report on the increasing collaboration between Israel and South Africa, for transmittal to the Organization of African Unity, the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, the League of Arab States, the Security Council, and the next session of the General Assembly.

HABITAT

The UN's Habitat (Human Settlements) Conference, held in Vancouver, Canada, May 31-June 11, 1976, offered still another opportunity to introduce the Zionism issue. There were, of course, the usual explicit assertions that Zionism was racist in statements by PLO and other Arab representatives. The Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements, 1976, adopted by the Conference, had included in draft form a principle (No. 4) that stated: "Human dignity and the exercise of free choice consistent with overall public welfare are basic rights which must be assured in every society. It is therefore the duty of all people to join the struggle against any form of colonialism, foreign aggression and occupation, domination, apartheid and any other discrimination." The Conference approved an Iraqi amendment to insert, in place of the last three words the phrase "and all forms of racism and racial discrimination as referred to in resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Though the Declaration contained other language implicitly directed against Israel, opposition to the document centered mainly on this Iraqi amendment. It was

adopted by a vote of 89 to 15, with ten abstentions; most of the negative votes and abstentions came from the Western nations. Three Latin American states abstained, as did Portugal, which had voted for Resolution 3379. Brazil and Mexico voted yes, as did the Holy See. (A member of the Holy See delegation later explained: "We didn't agree with the interpretation that some people place on that paragraph. It could have been construed as being anti-Zionist or anti-Jewish, but it was not specifically so. The Holy See did not consider that it was being anti-Jewish by voting yes on the declaration. We are definitely not anti-Jewish.")

The Conference ended with a series of statements by Western delegations repudiating this and other politically motivated provisions in the Declaration and recommendations. Christian Herter Jr., acting head of the United States delegation, hinted at a possible United States boycott of future UN technical conferences: " we are sorely disappointed that so much time and effort has been expended in discussion of problems of a political nature essentially extraneous to the substantive work of this Conference. There is good reason to believe that public esteem for the United Nations will be seriously impaired by this record. Continuation of this type of tactic does not bode well for my country's support and participation in future UN conferences concerned with global problems demanding international attention."⁴⁹

* * *

The persistence of the effort to inject the Zionism-racism equation into UN deliberations is disquieting. Still, the voting pattern on the Zionism issue did not reflect a genuine international consensus. At most, it represented the opinions of various Arab-Muslim-Communist states and other nations aligned with them or having to vote with them for political and other reasons, once the issue was raised. Thus, as the Human Rights Committee of the International Law Association (American Branch) concluded in its 1975 report, Resolution 3379 could not be considered an international-law, norm-creating source.

SIDNEY LISKOFKY

⁴⁹New York Times, June 13, 1976.

APPENDIX

3379 (XXX). *Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination*

Date: 10 November 1975

Meeting: 2400

Vote: 72-35-32 (roll call)

Report: A/10320

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaiming the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in particular its affirmation that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous" and its expression of alarm at "the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas in the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures",

Recalling also that, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned, *inter alia*, the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism,

Taking note of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace,⁴ proclaimed by the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, which promulgated the principle that "international co-operation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms, as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination",

Taking note also of resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twelfth ordinary session,⁵ held at Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, which considered "that the racist régime in occupied Palestine and the racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being",

Taking note also of the Political Declaration and Strategy to Strengthen International Peace and Security and to Intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among

⁴E/5725, part one, sect. I.

⁵See A/10297, annex II.

Non-Aligned Countries,⁶ adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, which most severely condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology,

Determines that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

⁶A/10217 and Corr.1, annex, p. 3.

ROLL-CALL VOTE ON RESOLUTION 3379 (XXX):

YES-ABSTAIN-NO

- Afghanistan _____
 Albania _____
 Algeria _____
 Argentina _____
 Australia _____
 Austria _____
 Bahamas _____
 Bahrain _____
 Bangladesh _____
 Barbados _____
 Belgium _____
 Bhutan _____
 Bolivia _____
 Botswana _____
 Brazil _____
 Bulgaria _____
 Burma _____
 Burundi _____
 Byelorussian SSR _____
 Cambodia _____
 Canada _____
 Cape Verde _____
 Central African Rep _____
 Chad _____
 Chile _____
 China _____
 Colombia _____
 Congo _____
 Costa Rica _____
 Cuba _____
 Cyprus _____
 Czechoslovakia _____
 Dahomey _____
 Democratic Yemen _____
 Denmark _____
 Dominican Republic _____
 Ecuador _____
 Egypt _____
 El Salvador _____
 Equatorial Guinea _____

YES-ABSTAIN-NO

- Ethiopia _____
 Fiji _____
 Finland _____
 France _____
 Gabon _____
 Gambia _____
 German Dem. Rep. _____
 Germany, Fed. Rep. _____
 Ghana _____
 Greece _____
 Grenada _____
 Guatemala _____
 Guinea _____
 Guinea-Bissau _____
 Guyana _____
 Haiti _____
 Honduras _____
 Hungary _____
 Iceland _____
 India _____
 Indonesia _____
 Iran _____
 Iraq _____
 Ireland _____
 Israel _____
 Italy _____
 Ivory Coast _____
 Jamaica _____
 Japan _____
 Jordan _____
 Kenya _____
 Kuwait _____
 Laos _____
 Lebanon _____
 Lesotho _____
 Liberia _____
 Libyan Arab Republic _____
 Luxembourg _____
 Madagascar _____
 Malawi _____

YES-ABSTAIN-NO

- Malaysia _____
 Maldives _____
 Mali _____
 Malta _____
 Mauritania _____
 Mauritius _____
 Mexico _____
 Mongolia _____
 Morocco _____
 Mozambique _____
 Nepal _____
 Netherlands _____
 New Zealand _____
 Nicaragua _____
 Niger _____
 Nigeria _____
 Norway _____
 Oman _____
 Pakistan _____
 Panama _____
 Papua New Guinea _____
 Paraguay _____
 Peru _____
 Philippines _____
 Poland _____
 Portugal _____
 Qatar _____
 Romania _____
 Rwanda _____
 Sao Tome and Principe _____
 Saudi Arabia _____

YES-ABSTAIN-NO

- Senegal _____
 Sierra Leone _____
 Singapore _____
 Somalia _____
 South Africa _____
 Spain _____
 Sri Lanka _____
 Sudan _____
 Swaziland _____
 Sweden _____
 Syrian Arab Republic _____
 Thailand _____
 Togo _____
 Trinidad and Tobago _____
 Tunisia _____
 Turkey _____
 Uganda _____
 Ukrainian SSR _____
 USSR _____
 United Arab Emirates _____
 United Kingdom _____
 Un. Rep. of Cameroon _____
 Un. Rep. of Tanzania _____
 United States _____
 Upper Volta _____
 Uruguay _____
 Venezuela _____
 Yemen _____
 Yugoslavia _____
 Zaire _____
 Zambia _____