

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1975th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 22 October 1971,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 93: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1
Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971 ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	8

*President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).*

AGENDA ITEM 93

**Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic  
of China in the United Nations (*continued*)**

1. Mr. CASTILLO VALDES (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again Guatemala wishes to state its unshakable faith in the United Nations, and when we participate in the discussion of world problems we do so in the hope and with the conviction that each day of work concludes with a stronger and more functional United Nations.

2. At this time in order to achieve the desired peace and development for all the world's people we must give new momentum to international integration. In 1945 my country was present when the United Nations was being formed, and our adherence to the principle of universality was made obvious then and is ratified by us today. Respect for the sovereignty of organized States must be maintained, and must particularly be nourished in and by this world Organization.

3. Guatemala believes ardently that the honest participation of all peoples of the earth, be they organized as great or small nations, is imperative if we are to strengthen international peace and security for the benefit of all mankind.

4. The entry of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must never be in exchange for the ouster of the Republic of China. The existence of both States and their historical, geographical and statistical description are far too well known by all delegations to require repetition. The entry of a State, whose primary condition for admission is that it is outside the Organization, is very clearly covered by the provisions of the Charter. However, the case of the People's Republic of China is a unique case; its entry is called for by a large number of delegations, and the best formula possible must be devised by the parties concerned in order to bring it about.

5. The expulsion of a State, furthermore, is also clearly provided for in Article 6 of the Charter of the United Nations, when a State "has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter" and "upon the recommendation of the Security Council". In the present case, none of these conditions have been met. A large number of speakers have stated that what is at stake is not the question of expelling a State; and yet, when approval is given to the expulsion of the delegation of a strong, democratic and progressive Government, the final result is, in fact, the expulsion of the Republic of China within the context that delegations know full well.

6. The Guatemalan delegation hopes that an adequate solution will be found, one that is acceptable to the parties, and for that purpose time is necessary. If for 22 years this General Assembly has enjoyed cordial relations and mutual co-operation with the Republic of China, surely we have a right to hope that in the future this Assembly will continue to enjoy friendly relations and co-operation with the People's Republic of China; but it is imperative that the admission of one State not be made a justification for the expulsion of another. Since time is a great builder, and if we work without haste, we might also venture to hope that a solution might be found by the two States in the very near future.

7. The approval of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 means the expulsion of the Republic of China, and as Article 18 states, this without doubt is an important question, and as was the case at previous sessions, the important nature of the matter was admitted by more than half the members of this Assembly. Very firmly and unequivocally the delegation of Guatemala rejects the draft resolution I have just mentioned. We also wish to declare that this question of the representation of China must be considered according to the letter and the spirit of the principles of the Charter.

8. Because of the gravity of a case of expulsion and in order to avoid any such precedents being set up, the delegation of Guatemala will vote in favour of the proposal to give priority in the voting to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, of which, with 21 other countries, my delegation is a sponsor.

9. Finally, we wish to express the heartfelt hope of my country that this General Assembly will find and approve the formula which realistically would solve divergencies such as the present one and achieve the admission of peoples still outside the United Nations to the Organization, without thereby causing the direct or indirect expulsion of another Member State.

10. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): The present debate on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is distinguished by certain features that set it apart from previous debates on this issue. It takes place in an atmosphere of international *détente* and against a background of certain developments that are viewed by some as representing a change in the policy of the United States towards the question of representation of the People's Republic of China at the United Nations.

11. The United States has for some years been able to muster enough support at this Assembly to prevent even the inclusion of the question of China's representation in the agenda of the General Assembly. Thus Premier Chou En-lai's request—first made on 18 November 1949<sup>1</sup> and repeated on 8 January the following year<sup>2</sup>—for rectifying the representation of China and for according to the representative of the Government of the People's Republic of China his rightful place at the Security Council, went unheeded. Eventually, the United States had to accept the inevitability of a substantive discussion on Chinese representation, but resorted to the procedural device of invoking Article 18 of the Charter and categorizing the question as falling within the meaning of that Article. The fact that it was patently obvious that Article 18 of the Charter was inapplicable, did not deter successive spokesmen for the United States at this Assembly from invoking it and from mustering enough votes in support of their position. Thus the representative of Chiang Kai-shek's régime in Taiwan continued to speak on behalf of China.

12. Now the United States is once again seeking to subject the question of Chinese representation at the United Nations to the requirements of its national policies; and it is a sad fact of international life that once again the United States may succeed in imposing on the United Nations a scheme that would effectively exclude the People's Republic of China from the counsels of this Organization.

13. We see that, after 20 years of obdurate resistance, the United States is now willing to admit the right of representation of the People's Republic of China and its occupancy of a seat at the Security Council as a permanent member, but it is not yet willing to accept the inescapable conclusion that follows from this admission, namely, that the representative of Chiang Kai-shek's régime no longer has a place in this Organization.

14. Let us recall that the representative from Chiang Kai-shek's régime has not been here as a representative of the island of Taiwan; nor would he countenance such a claim. Mr. Chow Shu-kai, in his address to this Assembly on 18 October, leaves no doubt about the nature of his alleged mandate. Mr. Chow maintained that:

“... during the war years the Republic of China lost a major portion of its territory and was cut off from land and sea communication with other parts of Asia. Yet no one questioned the right of the Government of the Republic of China to speak and act on behalf of the

Chinese people at international conferences.” [1967th meeting, para. 34.]

15. It is not my purpose here to question the veracity of that statement. Suffice it to point out that it is indicative of the position taken by Chiang Kai-shek's régime in Formosa and tenaciously maintained even in the face of the desertion of one its staunchest defenders, the United States of America.

16. The United States is now questioning the right of the Republic of China to speak and act on behalf of the Chinese people, and it is now proposing a formula for dual representation. On the other hand, the Government of the People's Republic of China is no less adamant in its rejection of the dismemberment of its territory implied by the proposal for dual Chinese representation.

17. The evidence of history and international agreements serves to support the view that Taiwan is an island province of China. Therefore it is most reprehensible for the United States to seek to change the status of Taiwan and confer upon it a separateness that the Chinese themselves do not desire. It would be contrary to the Charter of the United Nations if this Organization were to follow the lead of the United States and adopt a proposal amounting to a serious violation of the territorial integrity of China and a denial of the will of the Chinese people.

18. Draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 should, therefore, be rejected by the Assembly, as it would be rejected by the People's Republic of China and as indeed it should, for the sake of consistency, be rejected by the so-called Government of the Republic of China. My delegation will certainly vote against it.

19. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan has repeatedly maintained that the purpose of the United Nations, as a functional organization for world peace and security, would be better served by the admission of the People's Republic of China to its counsels. This is a view from which there has been little dissent. It has been admitted, even by the representatives of the United States Government, that the People's Republic of China should “play a constructive role in the family of nations” [1902nd meeting, para. 88].

20. Let us not undermine this constructive role and impede the effective participation of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic by claiming that the Formosa Government has also a distinct role to play in the councils of the United Nations.

21. I should now like to comment on the other proposal by the United States, in draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, urging the General Assembly to decide:

“that any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter”.

22. My delegation, as well as others, has had occasion to observe that this procedural ruse has been used by the United States with the specific purpose of excluding the

<sup>1</sup> See document A/1123 (mimeographed).

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 1*, 459th meeting, p. 2.

People's Republic of China from the United Nations. There is no reason for us to believe it is not being used now to serve the same purpose. No amount of sophistry will convince us otherwise. It has been amply demonstrated in the course of this debate that no new State is seeking admission to the United Nations and no Member of the Organization is being expelled. It seems almost superfluous to state at this juncture that the question we have been dealing with concerns the propriety of the representation of China by a Government that is not and has not been for 20 years in control of the territory it claims to represent.

23. So much has been said in defence of objectivity and justice on this question. For us, objectivity does not mean an equidistance from truth and falsehood. Indeed, it is impossible to be impartial between justice and injustice. For too long an injustice has been done to the People's Republic of China by maintaining a fiction and by denying the lawful right of representation to it. Now that at last we seem to have awakened to reality, let us face the full responsibility of this awakening and let us not persist in the error which can only result in the People's Republic of China's remaining out of the United Nations.

24. Let us acknowledge that it follows from the decision to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representative of its Government as the only legitimate representative of China in the United Nations that there would be no place in this Organization for the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek's régime. It is our plea and sincere hope that this Assembly, after so many years, will act to redeem itself and to vindicate the principles of the Charter by rejecting the proposal for dual representation and thus ensuring that legality is restored and justice is done.

25. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): During the present debate efforts have been made to sow confusion around the question before us, that is, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

26. In the past efforts were made to turn this item into an important question by claiming that the issue concerned the admission of a new Member. In the present debate, mention is made of the expulsion of a Member of the United Nations, the self-determination of peoples, and many other ideas; yet the basic facts of the situation are simple and clear: it is a question of knowing who represents China in the United Nations.

27. For more than 20 years, ever since the question of the representation of China in the United Nations was brought to the General Assembly, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has adopted and maintained a very clear position on the problem, one in keeping with the progressive development of the world and present-day realities.

28. Together with the other socialist countries, as far as our possibilities have allowed, my country has constantly striven for restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and, therefore, for the expulsion of those who, with the complicity of certain Western Powers, headed by the United States, illegally

occupy that place, contending that they represented and continue to represent China in the Organization.

29. Whenever the problem of the representation of China has been raised at sessions of the General Assembly, on the initiative of one country or another, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has firmly defended the position of its Government, namely, that there is only one China, the People's Republic of China and that Taiwan is an integral and inseparable part of it.

30. We have always been opposed to any attempts being made under different pretexts and by using arguments to justify one-sided, and often very elaborate, interpretations of certain principles of the Charter in order to establish a seeming basis on which to rest the "two Chinas" thesis. Many countries, torn between their attachment to their alliance with the United States and their awareness of realities, have tried to find a solution to their difficulty by the creation of the "two Chinas" thesis. And yet the great majority has realized that any attempt to find a solution on the basis of the division of China into two parts is not realistic and is not a solution at all. To the contrary, it raises numerous difficulties and new and more difficult problems for both the United Nations and world peace. Many States Members of the United Nations which have recently shed the colonial yoke were at times in no position to stem the efforts and the divisive manoeuvres from outside, and if some of those countries began to be divided, this would create a danger to their security.

31. The rapid evolution of world public opinion on the question of the representation of China, the powerful current that has been felt to make the United Nations into a truly effective organization, adapted to the needs and requirements of the contemporary world, and into a universal Organization, has exercised a very healthy influence even on the most recalcitrant Members of the United Nations. The United States has finally begun to realize that, under these circumstances, it was no longer possible, even by resorting to old procedural tricks, successfully to oppose this powerful and irresistible current of world public opinion for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Although very important, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is only a procedural problem. The attempts to make of a single aspect of the problem—that is to say, the abandonment of the seat of China illegally occupied by the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and thus to clear the place—an important question is nothing but a new trick solely and only designed to postpone a historic solution which has become inevitable.

32. Being fully aware that, even if it succeeds in placing new obstacles in the path of the immediate entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, these obstacles would only be temporary, the United States, by resorting to these kinds of manoeuvres, is merely trying to create a certain image of its own policies. It is trying to create the impression that, even in the case of sudden switches in its policy, it will never abandon its friends, such as the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and other reactionary régimes which have been rejected by their peoples.

33. That the United States should try temporarily to block an immediate solution to the problem is perfectly

understandable. It is seeking to save face, to reassure the reactionary régimes and Governments and to make it clear to them, that they will always find support and an ally in the United States if they are in distress and, above all, when their people no longer want them.

34. The attempt to win a procedural victory in the United Nations in favour of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, after it has lost the battle against the Chinese people as a whole, is a manoeuvre that must inevitably fail. From now on, nothing can prevent the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, nor prevent it from taking its place. The United States is fully convinced of this and has already cut its losses; those concerned have realized this and will realize it more clearly at the moment of truth. Draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 submitted by the United States is proof of what I am saying. That draft states there that the People's Republic of China has the right to be represented in the United Nations, including the right to occupy a seat as one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

35. The terms of the draft resolution submitted by the United States are sufficiently clear: without expressly stating so, it provides for the expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the permanent seat at present occupied by them in the Security Council. The United States knows full well that what it is trying to get the General Assembly to endorse—to increase by one the number of Members of the United Nations by a mere vote in the General Assembly—is in flagrant contradiction of the terms of the Charter. This is illegal and consequently unacceptable to the United Nations. As we know, to create a new seat in the United Nations there must first be a decision of the Security Council, followed by its ratification by the General Assembly by a two-thirds majority. Therefore the United States has no illusions that this new ruse is going to succeed.

36. Nevertheless, by this stratagem, the United States is trying to water down the effect of its decision finally to recognize reality. Following the old adage of making a virtue of necessity, it has decided to recognize the existence of the People's Republic of China.

37. Being impassioned and pathetic at the same time in his statement before the General Assembly—we would have preferred those efforts to have been made in defence of a nobler cause than that of the division of China—the representative of the United States nevertheless declared that the time had come to have the People's Republic of China in the United Nations [1966th meeting]. It is amazing to note that the United States now maintains that the People's Republic of China could take part in and contribute to the work of the United Nations. One wonders why it is time now but not 20 years ago. The People's Republic of China has existed for more than 20 years. Its population has always been about a quarter of the world's total and 20 years ago it had the same territory it has now. Is this attitude on the part of the United States not the consequence of the application of the recently inaugurated Nixon doctrine, one of whose fundamental principles is the existence of divergencies in the socialist camp?

38. According to the magazine *U.S. News & World Report*, despite the denials of President Nixon, the United

States is actively seeking to profit from its latest initiatives with the People's Republic of China.

39. A well-known journalist in the United States, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, unveiled somewhat more of the American batteries in an article entitled "Negotiating in a New Light" in *The New York Times* of 17 October 1971, in which he wrote:

"One of the shrewdest French diplomats I know predicted eight months ago 'If the United States and China can find a means of rapprochement we will see the way open up to a solution of the problem of Indochina, and other countries, including the Soviet Union, will have to subscribe to it.'"

"... What North Vietnam and the Vietcong fear most is any accommodation between the United States and China that might tend to isolate their military position.

"The obvious purpose of Soviet President Podgorny's recent journey to Hanoi was to confirm Russian support. But if China again slows up transshipments across its territory of Soviet material for North Viet-nam—as it has done in the past—Hanoi's problem becomes harder.

"...

"There are indications that some kind of accommodation may be worked out during the next few months, that this will be basically arranged between Washington and Peking..."<sup>3</sup>

That quotation, I think, speaks for itself.

40. But information given in the communications media, as well as declarations and positions defined officially, lead us to believe that certain circles in the United States are awaiting political developments which will favour their designs in Asia; in exchange for foreclosing the old mortgage of 20 years' standing they will allow the People's Republic of China finally to take its place in the United Nations.

41. If this is the purpose for which the United States is engaging in last-minute manoeuvres, the other party surely will have its say. We are convinced that the Chinese Communists will not lend themselves to such manoeuvres: that is, to try to recover what is legally theirs by agreeing to maintain existing divergences between socialist countries and thus promote the aims of the United States policy.

42. The People's Republic of China has a right to be in the United Nations—and it will be here. Nothing can hold back the movement that will sweep it to its rightful place in the world Organization. A contribution to that end would be massive support for draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, sponsored by Albania, Algeria and others. This will, obviously, imply an equally massive vote against the two draft resolutions presented by the United States and others [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2]. Such a vote will serve immediately to bring the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and, at the same

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

time, serve well the cause of peace and the efforts of the United Nations.

43. Mr. PANYA (Laos) (*interpretation from French*): The Royal Government of Laos considers that the question which appears as agenda item 93, namely, "The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", is one of great importance.

44. As was stated by our Prime Minister from this rostrum a few weeks ago:

"The main characteristic of our Organization is its universality and, as everyone is aware, that objective can never be attained so long as the 700 million people of China do not participate in its work. This gap is all the more significant, since that country and that people not only have the inherent right to have a voice in international affairs, but our Organization can make great progress only if that country and people, acting in respect for the Charter and Member States, agree to co-operate sincerely and loyally with the United Nations. This people has a rich cultural heritage and a vast country of great possibilities. Their achievements deserve our respect and admiration. Of this my Government and delegation are firmly convinced.

"At the appropriate time, therefore, we will state our support for the admission of the People's Republic of China to our Organization. In accordance with the considerations I have just mentioned, and in harmony with the spirit which prompts us, we would hope that that country would occupy a permanent seat in the Security Council." [1943rd meeting, paras. 33 and 34.]

45. That time has now come, and my delegation is ready to confirm by a vote the position taken by our Government. We shall therefore vote for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and we shall also vote in favour of the recommendation that it be given a permanent seat in the Security Council.

46. The position of my Government is solidly founded on both the concept and the precepts of the Charter itself. To ensure the Organization's universality it is impossible to keep out a people which represents one quarter of mankind; and, if we wish to ensure the rapid and harmonious advancement of its work, we cannot overlook the contribution of a people whose merits and achievements, both past and present, are generally recognized.

47. The place of the People's Republic of China as a great Asian Power in a sensitive region which for so many years has been beset by continual hostilities makes even more paradoxical its absence from our Organization, an Organization in which we have been seeking, so far in vain, for possible ways of extinguishing the war in South-East Asia.

48. There are other reasons which impel my delegation to cast its vote in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and to a permanent seat in the Security Council. These reasons include in particular the policy of good-neighbourliness and coexistence which is unfailingly practised by my Government. Laos has a common frontier with the People's

Republic of China and for almost 10 years has maintained diplomatic relations with it; and as far back as one may go in history, there has never been any dispute between Laos and China which has resulted in armed conflict. This is a remarkable historical example which should certainly be known and followed. That is why we thought it useful to point it out to this Assembly.

49. On the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to our Organization there are, my delegation notes, no divergent views. All representatives who have spoken from this rostrum have expressed the same view, and it may be expected that those who will follow me will do the same.

50. Along with that almost unanimous agreement, that desire which all share, there is, however, a difference of view which is proving to be more and more irreconcilable. That concerns the question of whether, as a consequence of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, the Republic of China, which has been represented in the United Nations since its foundation, should be maintained or excluded from the Organization.

51. From the outset of the discussion, that is to say for a whole week, vigorous and sometimes impassioned pleas have been entered on this point. No argument has been overlooked, no example forgotten; nor has any precedent been left out of account by the opposed parties in supporting their respective cases.

52. May I say immediately that my Government endorses neither the practice nor the theory of "two Chinas", nor does it accept the practice or the theory of "one China, one Taiwan". The profound truth is that we respect the Charter and the principles which govern international relations, particularly non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States. That is the unshakable basis of our policy and we should like to have it applied in return to ourselves.

53. On that understanding, my delegation would like to put to the Assembly the following considerations.

54. First, the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for several years and the lengthy discussions devoted to it have never produced a solution, or even the beginnings of one. Today, on the other hand, conditions are favourable and possible agreement is within our grasp.

55. Secondly, universal wisdom has always recommended that faced with a difficult, complex and controversial question one proceeds stage by stage, demonstrating calm and patience, taking advantage of even the smallest results in order to broaden the area of agreement. The question before us is one which has caused much ink to flow—and also, it must be said, much saliva. Our memory is not so short that we can forget the clear-cut positions, the heated and vehement statements, even in certain cases the invective exchanged, on this subject. Do we intend today to achieve a miracle and, by adopting a resolution, to bring about immediately an ideal situation of peace and concord in place of the situation of conflict which has prevailed for a quarter of a century? Is there not a danger that by trying

in one fell swoop to bring about a comprehensive and global solution we may stifle the hopes which have just been born?

56. Thirdly, at a time when the peoples of countries in Europe, as in Asia, which various circumstances have divided, are becoming aware of the futility of their disputes and endeavouring to find a basis for reconciliation and concord, supported in this endeavour by the whole international community would we not, by adopting an inadequate and inappropriate resolution undermine those praiseworthy efforts and, to go back to the case of the Chinese people, crystallize a hostility which, unfortunately, has already lasted too long?

57. Fourthly, the way in which the Chinese people are represented in the United Nations is undoubtedly a matter for those people themselves to decide. Would not our Assembly, by attempting to indicate and impose its point of view—which is perhaps sincere and praiseworthy—go beyond its proper framework of advice and recommendation? Is this not what is known as a domestic question?

58. In any event, on this point my delegation is well qualified to speak. If to this day Laos has been beset by insurmountable difficulties it is because peoples and countries have interfered in our own affairs. If the Laotian people had been left to their own devices the domestic difficulties in Laos would long since have disappeared and hostilities between various factions would long since have ceased, and peace and reconciliation would have been restored in the kingdom.

59. In order to avoid any misunderstanding and to forestall any tendentious interpretation that certain countries or certain political groupings might be tempted to make, I wish now to reaffirm my Government's position.

60. My delegation will vote for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. It will also vote for the recommendation that it be granted a permanent seat on the Security Council. Regarding what is called dual representation, my delegation believes that the maintenance in or withdrawal from the Organization of the Republic of China should be left to the Chinese public themselves to decide in all freedom, as we ourselves in Laos desire to resolve our own problems in all freedom. Consequently, we consider it our duty to refrain from pronouncing on that point.

61. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): It is now nine days since my last intervention before this august Assembly [1965th meeting]. On that occasion, the delegation of Burundi drew up and defended a vast repertoire of compelling arguments in favour of the unrestricted presence, in this forum, of the People's Republic of China.

62. Today, greatly reassured by the accelerated progress toward the happy and fateful day when Peking will recover its rights in this Assembly, my delegation is prompted anew to confirm and reinforce the thesis it expounded with regard to China less than 10 days ago. Two indivisible aspects are involved, namely, China's representation in the United Nations, and the indivisibility of the Chinese nation.

63. Ever since Burundi reconquered its full sovereignty and independence with the proclamations of the Republic, it has always acted as an ardent disciple of the United Nations Charter and of international law, while at the same time adapting its actions to conform with the postulates of history. Thus, free from the antagonistic influences which at times shake our Organization, my Government has endeavoured, with unswerving diligence, to cling to the intrinsic characteristics peculiar to every nation.

64. People, territory and, hence, diplomatic representation constitute the trilogy of essential components of any collectivity having the status of a State.

65. Firm in our belief in the Organization, on 13 October, before this Assembly, we affirmed that, under the Charter, and more particularly Article 2 thereof, the Government of Burundi would be acting in contradiction to the Charter and evading its political and legal imperatives, if it were to withdraw or restrict its support of the indivisible entity; the indefeasible sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of China.

66. To put the problem in its broad and only context, I feel inescapably bound to draw a parallel, or rather, to personalize the case of China. The 131 Member States are all empowered and ready to defend, at all costs and quite rightly, the indivisibility of their respective peoples, the integrity of their territories, and the identity of their representation in both bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. History, ancient and modern, bears witness to the fact that States have always preferred to choose war, with all the nefarious consequences it entails, rather than to sacrifice or yield up a single one of the three basic criteria I have just mentioned.

67. No matter what its geographical size, great or small, no matter how large or small its population, no Government would carry its generosity to the point of renouncing, in favour of another State, any portion of its territory or any part of its population. If the other Governments have proved incapable of such disinterested action, why should the United Nations believe itself entitled to demand that China make such a sacrifice?

68. If the rights and attributes inherent in any genuine national sovereignty are accorded to all other States, on what grounds could our Organization feel entitled to deprive the People's Republic of China of the inalienable and universal prerogatives that all Governments enjoy over the totality of their national territories, their citizens and their diplomacy?

69. Dual representation not only would be tantamount to a deep humiliation unjustly inflicted on a Member State; it would also usher in the first phase of a dangerous era in which two standards of weight and measure would be used in the world community.

70. If the worst comes to worst, if this Assembly decides on dual representation for China, it will thus make more likely an outbreak in the future of plural representation for national entities.

71. Confronted with such bitter possibilities, one wonders whether this Assembly would be in a position to guarantee

that it would apply the rule and impose the fate advocated by those who maintain certain theses. For once the precedent has been created, any reversal would betoken a Machiavellianism and opportunism whose effect would be that the Assembly would adopt contradictory positions according to the interests of the moment.

72. The case of China is unique, it will be said, and cannot be repeated in other instances. We agree with this argument only in part. We recognize that the Chinese problem has its own peculiar features. This does not, however, mean that similar cases cannot occur in other States or collectivities having the status of States, under different guises and with the different labels that political genius and human subtlety are capable of devising.

73. Having cleared the ground, we can now come to the heart of the subject at its present stage.

74. We bow to the dazzling reality that China is a founding Member of the United Nations, and has remained a Member, but we cannot escape another blinding fact: that the People's Republic of China is not prepared to accept the kind of co-optation by other Members, which certain schools of thought are seeking to impose upon it. Restoration of the lawful rights of China in such a context would be incompatible with justice and reason; it would even be a distortion of the problem.

75. The objective of our efforts has only one name, and that is to make legitimate the representation of the People's Republic of China. Far from being merely the admission of one Member at the cost of expelling another, such legitimization would be a step towards a new fraternization of the sons and daughters of a single motherland. Hence, this singleness of China must be reflected and given concrete expression in the United Nations. In law as it is in fact, it is the Government of Peking that must exclusively hold the power of representation in this concert of nations.

76. To attain the desired objective, it is essential not only to adopt the means by which it can be reached, but also to conform to those means. It would be superfluous to emphasize how important it is to will the means if we wish to achieve the end.

77. In accordance with this maxim, my delegation will not depart from its traditional practice of rejecting, through a negative vote, all proposals, all draft resolutions or procedures which it regards as stumbling-blocks to the effective and immediate presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It will, on the other hand, vote for one draft resolution only, the one which calls for the restoration of the lawful rights of a single China—a step on the way to reunification. By this gesture we hope to help to redeem the mortgage on the sacred rights of the People's Republic of China.

78. Perhaps a question which is clearly inevitable should be posed. For 20 years the People's Republic of China has stubbornly refused to divide its representation into two categories, despite a General Assembly whose majority was hostile. Would it not be miraculous if that same China should today hasten to sacrifice, in an access of altruism, its rights and its principles when the world community is

unanimous in favour of its admission, something which is now absolutely inevitable?

79. Yes, the fate of mankind calls not for mere association, but for active and effective participation by the People's Republic of China in the conduct of world affairs. For how can the agonizing human tragedy which has been caused by the tragic events in East Pakistan be solved without the crucial participation of China? The end of decolonization, the eradication of racism in Africa, disarmament—in other words, peace and the survival of our very race—are all pressing questions which argue powerfully for the role of the People's Republic of China.

80. That immense country, provided it recovers its rights, will bring to bear a power and an influence which will have a great impact on the world. Burundi certainly hails the imminent arrival of that country with joy and confidence. We see it as an element which, together with the effectiveness of the United Nations, and for the same reasons, is henceforth essential to the general equilibrium. We see it also making a decisive contribution to the universality of our Organization, to the benefit of all its Members. I feel this deeply at this moment as I address this Assembly, and I am convinced that it is an element which, in today's world and the world of tomorrow, is essential to the human race, to the development of the universe, to its equilibrium, to its progress and to its peace.

81. The entry of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations marks for Burundi a historic turning-point on the bilateral level. Thanks to the republican institutions which Burundi established five years ago, our two countries have just renewed bonds that an impotent monarchy had almost compromised. In order to lend due solemnity to this new episode in the relations between Burundi and China, my Government decided to synchronize its declaration on China in this Assembly on 13 October with the circulation in Usumbura and Peking of a joint and simultaneous diplomatic communiqué when announcing the resumption of diplomatic representation in the two capitals at the ambassadorial level on the eve of the fifth anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of Burundi, which is to be commemorated on 28 November next.

82. The return of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations will be for us a prelude to the final settlement of a national problem 22 years old. Tackled from this angle, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China would not, in our opinion, mean ostracizing a part of China or dividing the citizens of one and the same country. In the final analysis it depends on the magnanimity of the Chinese mainland and of the diaspora in Formosa to bring about brotherly reconciliation and to avoid taking vindictive measures, in conformity with the wisdom of China according to which water does not remain in the mountains, neither does vengeance remain in a great heart.

83. To those who have been separated from their motherland, may they be guaranteed, if possible through United Nations mediation, their recovery of their rights of citizenship. How lucky they will be in associating themselves with the genius of that gigantic, new and reunited China, whose importance and destiny have reached planetary proportions!

84. To be sure, when divergent and, *a fortiori*, contradictory theses are pitted one against another, their respective protagonists are entitled to defend them with ardour and spirit. Nevertheless, in this case, the return of the People's Republic of China to this organization should not be regarded as a victory for one side or a defeat for the other; it will be a resounding triumph for peace and universality. There will be neither losers nor winners; there will be only a victory for the United Nations and thus, in the final analysis, for all Members of this Organization.

85. We are thus on the threshold of a new world equilibrium, which will be all the more beneficial because the leaders of the People's Republic of China will be an example to us through their political virtues which, by a happy contrast with their sheer size in all areas, reject megalomania in favour of magnanimity.

86. Mr. SEN (India): We are not discussing the admission of a State to the United Nations, for, if we were, we would have a recommendation of the Security Council under Article 4, paragraph 2, of the Charter. We are not discussing the expulsion of a Member State for, in that event, we would also have the views of the Security Council under Article 6 of the Charter. Inevitably, those who have, for whatever purpose, chosen not to take full account of these two central facts have found themselves beset with contradictions, unconstitutional propositions, twisted procedure and false dogmas. Many speakers before me have exposed and analysed these and I would not repeat their arguments.

87. We had hoped that after the recent trends—that we welcome—for greater understanding of and co-operation with China by several countries, all thoughts of complicating the question of Chinese representation by various stratagems would be given up. Unfortunately, not only have they not been abandoned, but a gloomy danger of expulsion of Member States has been mentioned, when in fact no such danger exists. Refuge has been taken even behind the phrase “to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek” as an endorsement of the view that expulsion is involved. The representative of the Netherlands, as indeed many others, have made short shrift of this argument, if indeed it is an argument, by pointing out that this phrase in draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 is merely a step which follows automatically from the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China and has nothing to do with the expulsion of any Member State. The text is clear enough; it mentions expelling the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, merely because their presence is illegal.

88. The simple issue before us is that there is only one China—and that China is the People's Republic of China. There is only one Chinese seat in the United Nations, and the People's Republic of China alone is entitled to it. India has recognized this straightforward truth ever since 1949 and has consistently supported the rights of the People's Republic of China to be the sole representative of China in the United Nations. We shall, in accordance with this consistent attitude, vote for draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and vote against all other draft resolutions, amendments and procedural motions which may have the effect, either directly or indirectly, of delaying or confusing the simple issue I have stated. We look forward to the

People's Republic of China taking its place among us—a place which it has by right—just as we look forward to better relations between India and China. The sooner these hopes are realized, the better.

89. Much has been said about realism. In our view, nothing could be more unrealistic than to delay any longer the full participation of China in the United Nations by its proper representatives, that is, the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China. There may be many ways of coming to realistic solutions, but surely they cannot be reached by discussing the nature and the character of different parts of the Chinese State or by attempting to decide what they should or should not do. Ours is an Organization of sovereign States, and our simple duty now is to decide that the People's Republic of China alone can represent China. All other arguments can only introduce confusion, and it is our hope that all delegations will concentrate on the one and only clear question before us.

*Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971 (concluded)\**

90. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply with regard to this matter.

91. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Our delegation associates itself fully with the statement of indignation and protest made yesterday from this rostrum [1972nd meeting] by the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union, Comrade Malik, concerning the terrorist act committed against the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. He was quite right in saying that the continual provocations against staff of Soviet missions and agencies in the city of New York and other cities in the United States are primarily to be explained by the connivance of the United States authorities with thugs from the Fascist Zionist gang known as the Jewish Defense League.

92. Our delegation expresses protest and indignation at this situation, because the building on 67th Street also houses the Permanent Mission of the Ukrainian SSR to the United Nations, and the more so as the terrorist act referred to took place during a reception being given there by the Ukrainian Mission for delegations from other States Members of the United Nations. When the shots rang out, there were quite a number of General Assembly representatives and Secretariat staff at the reception.

93. The Permanent Mission of the Ukrainian SSR to the United Nations has repeatedly addressed notes of protest to the United States Mission in connexion with the acts of hooliganism and provocations by the so-called Jewish Defense League. However, this has had no effect. All Soviet persons working and living both on 67th Street and in other parts of New York City continue to be in danger.

94. Some statements have been made attempting to distort the true state of affairs.

\* Resumed from the 1973rd meeting.

95. For purposes of political speculation, the representative of Israel has tried to make use of a tragic episode from the time of the Hitlerite occupation of the Ukraine. In Kiev alone, more than 200,000 of our citizens were shot and brutally tortured by the Fascists. At Babi Yar, a Kiev suburb, about 130,000 people were shot by the Hitlerites, including about 70,000 Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality and almost as many Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians and people of other nationalities. We mourn those of all nationalities who died at the hands of the Fascist butchers, although for some reason the representative of Israel mentions only the death of Jews.

96. I should like to remind representatives that the Ukraine lost more than 4.5 million civilians alone in the territory occupied by the Fascists. The Hitlerite invaders destroyed and plundered a considerable part of our national wealth. After the war, our people really had to labour heroically for a long time in order to rebuild from the ashes and ruins hundreds of towns and thousands of villages, enterprises, schools, children's institutions and hospitals. But the memory of those who died in the war is fresh in the hearts of our people.

97. In the Ukraine, as everywhere in the Soviet Union, impressive monuments have been erected to the dead. At Babi Yar too, my Government has decided to replace the temporary monument with a monument to the victims of the Fascist occupation. This decision has been reported in the press and is undoubtedly known to the Israeli representative. I should like to stress that neither the representative of Israel nor any of his associates can dictate where, when or to whom our people should erect memorials.

98. I should now like to say a few words concerning zionism, which was so zealously defended by the Israeli representative. He tried to suggest that criticism of zionism is nothing other than anti-Semitism. But this is a well-known device of the Zionists. In his well-reasoned statement of 21 October [1973rd meeting], the Ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic exposed the essence of zionism. We need only add briefly that zionism is a reactionary, racist theory which is preached and propagated by the Jewish *bourgeoisie* in order to divert the workers from the struggle against capitalist oppression. Zionism lies at the root of the imperialist policy of the ruling circles in Israel—their policy of aggression and occupation.

99. Even the uninitiated can see that zionism is absolutely identical with the racist ideology of fascism. Is it then surprising that Zionists in the United States of America and other countries, in their unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-Arab campaign, are using the very same methods that were previously used by the Hitlerites?

100. We protest against the provocative terrorist acts perpetrated by the so-called Jewish Defense League and we consider that the United States authorities should take decisive measures to halt the acts of this bandit-like and Fascist organization.

101. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): The Iraqi delegation fully shares the feeling of anger and resentment which has been expressed by the delegation of the Soviet Union at the criminal act which was committed against it and threatened

the lives of four innocent children. That act was not an isolated one, and I fear it may not be the last one.

102. The Soviet Mission and a number of other Missions accredited to the United Nations have been subjected to a series of criminal acts spreading across the spectrum of terror, including threats, violent demonstrations, incursions into missions, bomb attacks and bullets. Threats and obscene calls have been a constant pattern of what we have had to suffer.

103. My delegation, in sharing the feeling of the Soviet Union, wishes to inform this Assembly that it also has not escaped such acts of criminality. Earlier this year, two fire-bombs were thrown during the night at the Iraqi Mission. Had they succeeded in doing the damage which had been intended, the three small children who were peacefully sleeping in the basement of the Mission would not be alive today. Incidentally, they happened to be American children.

104. The situation and insecurity of a number of missions to the United Nations have become so intolerable that we should not only protest the situation, but we should think of ways and means to deal effectively with it.

105. Mr. Bush and other United States representatives here and in other bodies of the United Nations have expressed their concern, their sympathy and their good intentions. We fully appreciate those feelings; but had feelings of concern and expressions of sympathy been enough to put an end to such acts, I would not have felt it necessary to come to this rostrum and take up precious minutes of your time.

106. The scope and the violence of these criminal acts have been increasing, not decreasing. The methods so far adopted for dealing with them have proved to be, in some cases, an incentive to the criminals to continue their acts. As far as the incident of the attack against the Iraqi Mission is concerned which happened earlier this year, no one has yet been arrested or charged, let alone sentenced to imprisonment in accordance with due process and justice.

107. We feel that there is a concerted campaign of vilification, lies and calumny against the socialist and Arab Missions. It emanates from Tel Aviv, is faithfully echoed by the Zionist organizations and is carried out by the American press and a major part of the Western press. This campaign, we feel, is directly responsible for encouraging the criminals in their extremism.

108. Mr. Bush yesterday felt hesitant about naming those organizations. We have no hesitation and no shame in naming the Zionists as being directly responsible for these criminal acts. If respectable, or allegedly respectable, Zionist organizations have expressed their disagreement with the methods adopted by the Jewish Defense League, they must share the responsibility for them. They have been feeding with their propaganda and with their lies the extreme emotions expressed by criminal acts carried out by the JDL. If the JDL is the fangs of the serpent, the Zionist organizations are the body that produces the poison.

109. This year the Informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations has heard many complaints from us and

from many other delegations that have been subjected to such criminal acts. Those acts, incidentally, were never confined to the Arab and Soviet delegations; many other delegations, whether European, African or Latin have also been threatened and assaulted. We feel that all our discussions and complaints have not produced the required results.

110. We feel also that the scope and the degree of these attacks have been escalating and increasing. We also feel that measures should be taken by the whole body of the United Nations to deal with, and put an end to, these acts. We feel that no Mission can function in the required atmosphere of security and tranquillity when it is under the threat of having its members attacked, innocent, sleeping children killed by bullets, and buildings burned or bombed.

111. We feel, therefore, that it is the collective responsibility of all of us to consider this question most seriously and most urgently and to devise ways and means to put an end to it. This is not a matter which concerns only one delegation; it is not a partisan matter: it is not, in a sense, a political matter; it is a matter which touches on the very fibre of the way the United Nations can work and function.

112. Therefore, my delegation, in consultation with other delegations, and in co-operation with them, will very soon submit a proposal for the inscription of an urgent item to be debated in plenary by the General Assembly concerning the security of missions and the safety of their personnel.<sup>4</sup>

113. I hope that through that debate we will face the problem fully and devise whatever means may be within our power to deal with it.

114. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): In the course of statements made in exercise of the right of reply yesterday and today two theories have been put forward that are contrary to international law and morality and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

115. It has been suggested here that of all human rights problems only the problem of the human rights of Jews, the problem of discrimination against, and the oppression of, Jews is not of international concern. All other questions of human rights are of international interest. They are discussed in the General Assembly and in its Committees; resolutions are adopted on questions of human rights which arise in various parts of the world. Sometimes committees are sent out in order to investigate the tragic plight of peoples that are being oppressed and denied their fundamental rights—all peoples except Jews.

116. The tragedy of, the continued discrimination against and the oppression of Jews is of no interest to the family of nations. That is what we have heard being suggested in this hall by a number of representatives who have preceded me.

117. Now, this has been precisely the situation of my people, the Jewish people, for centuries. For centuries we have been denied equality with other nations. For centuries we have been discriminated against and oppressed while the world remained silent. There were countries, like tsarist

Russia, where this situation became the cause for a saying, "Everyone except Jews". All had rights, all had rightful claims—all except Jews. But that will be so no more. We shall not remain silent, we cannot remain silent. The wounds inflicted on my people are all too fresh for us to remain tacit. We, each one of us physically, and our families, still remember the holocaust, the annihilation of 6 million of our brethren, while the world stood aside, looked on and kept silent. And therefore we shall no longer be silent.

118. This is not a matter which concerns Israel and Israel alone. The human rights of the Jewish people in any part of the world—whether in the Arab States or the Soviet Union—are of international concern. They are the concern of all enlightened public opinion, of men of goodwill anywhere, of Governments that support the Charter of the United Nations—whatever their social system, whatever their religious profession, whatever their race or creed.

119. Another theory has been put forward and repeated again and again; it is equally contrary to international law and the precepts of the Charter of the United Nations, which our Governments have all accepted. And that is the theory that denies the Jewish people the right, enjoyed by all other nations on the face of the earth, to a national liberation movement, to freedom, to independence, to sovereignty. Because that is what zionism is—the love of Zion, the longing to go back to Zion, to Israel, to Jerusalem. Why should this national liberation movement of ours be besmirched, as it has been here? Why should we be denied the right enjoyed by every other nation in every part of the world?

120. Is it because zionism dates back further than some of the more recent movements of national liberation? Is it because my people was conquered not 200 years ago, not 100 years ago, but almost 2,000 years ago? Is that reason to deny the Jewish people the right to regain its freedom and to live in independence? Is it because my people was not only subjugated but also uprooted from its land and dispersed all over the world? Is that reason to deny us the right to struggle, as all other nations have, more recently than we, to re-establish our sovereignty, to return to our homeland, to regain equality with other nations?

121. Why, then, is zionism besmirched, abused, slandered? Is it because it has proven successful, like some other movements of national liberation? Is it simply because it took us 2,000 years but we did prove successful in our struggle to regain independence in the land from which our forefathers were uprooted and dispersed? Is it because we succeeded in defending ourselves from the onslaught against our attempt to regain freedom—an onslaught carried out by all our neighbours, superior in numbers, superior in force? Is it because we were successful in repulsing another, more recent attempt, in 1967, aimed at stifling our right to continue to exist as an independent State?

122. Why should we be denied the rights that belong to all the nations present and represented here? Why should Arab spokesmen get up on this podium and say that, of all the peoples on the surface of the earth, one of the most ancient should not be permitted to live in independence in

<sup>4</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/8493.

a land in which every hill and every valley and every stone is linked with its history, with its being?

123. And of all peoples, of all representatives, the representatives of Arab States do that. Who has ever begrudged the Arab nation its right to freedom, its right to live in independence? There are 17 independent Arab Member States of the United Nations, all representing the great, admirable Arab world that has contributed so much to civilization. And in the twentieth century, after the Jewish people has suffered ages of discrimination, oppression and bloodshed, the Arab representatives get up here and deny us, begrudge us, the right to recreate our freedom in that little piece of land from which we were uprooted so long ago.

124. Is it because we resisted the imperialism and the colonialism of old, long before books were written explaining what imperialism and colonialism are? Is it because we had to bear the brunt of standing up for the very ideals to which representatives and their Governments have subscribed their names under the Charter? We have borne that brunt for 2,000 years—the brunt of the violation of human rights, the brunt of the denial to live in freedom, in independence, in one's own land.

125. Of course, it is natural that between national liberation movements clashes do occur; but does that mean that such a clash negates, annuls, the legitimacy of one of the confronting national liberation movements? If it so happens that the Arab leaders of recent days, unlike the Arab leaders of half a century ago, found it necessary, instead of welcoming the return of Jews to their land and the re-establishment of their rights in their land, to feed their peoples with hostility, with fanaticism, directing a continuous warfare against us—is this reason enough in 1971 to say, “A usurper State. The Jewish people have no right as other peoples have to live their own lives, to vindicate their own rights”?

126. There was even a time, I remember, when some of the very representatives that today deny us this right to a national liberation movement and abuse this national liberation movement—the love of Zion, the love of our land, the prayer, the longing to return to it and to live in it like free men—approved of it and spoke out in the United Nations in its favour, understood it, and proclaimed it openly, clearly, unequivocally in these very halls. There were times when the Soviet representatives spoke of aggression against the Jewish national liberation movement in Palestine being aggressed against by the Arab States. What has happened since 1948 to turn this very same national liberation movement into an object of slander, invective and abuse which certainly does not belong to these halls of the United Nations?

127. We bear no ill will to our neighbours. We welcome the advent to independence of so many sectors of the great Arab nation. But we do claim, we shall continue to claim, and we shall continue to defend with all our soul and all our heart and all our might, the right of the Jewish people to the same freedom and independence which the Arab nation enjoys in 17 independent Arab States.

128. As Shakespeare once said: “All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players.” This may be

true; it may be true even in our times. But sometimes it is necessary to tear the mask off. Because it seems that there is something wrong, something very wrong in our Organization, if the representative of Syria, for instance, can get up and preach on international behaviour to all of us assembled here. Syria, which was among the Arab States that invaded Israel in 1948 in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and of resolutions of the United Nations! Syria, which sent a cable to the United Nations proclaiming, “This is going to be a massacre of Jews reminiscent of the Mongolian massacres”; this very Syria which has continued in a state of war against Israel until today—a Syria which refuses to participate in any peace-making effort by the United Nations; a Syria which repudiates the fundamental, the central basis for these peace-making efforts, Security Council resolution 242 (1967)! And this Syria comes here before us to preach to us on how to behave and how not to behave in international relations!

129. There is something wrong in our Organization if the representative of Syria can get up and throw at us the epithets “Nazis, Fascists”—this very Syria which collaborated with Nazi Germany; this very Syria which waited until the war was over to declare war on Germany, which it did a few days before the deadline of 1 March 1945, to be able to enjoy the fruits of victory for which so many nations paid in millions and millions of lives of their citizens. It is this Syria that accuses us—the victims of Nazis, the remnants of a people decimated by Hitlerite barbarism—of being Nazis. It is this Syria which till today harbours a considerable concentration of Nazi experts that advise its Government, its intelligence services, its armed forces. It is this Syria whose Government is one of the few in the entire world which still today publishes and distributes Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in its army units—because we found it in the army units in the very Golan Heights about which we heard so much being said yesterday in a plaintive tone. This Syria dares to get up here and say to us, “Jews, you are Nazis.”

130. I wonder whether Ambassador Tomeh still remembers the song sung in the streets of Damascus in the 1940s when the world was bleeding under Nazi occupation or under the struggle for liberty against the Nazis, the song which went:

“*Bala Missiou, bala Mister,  
Bissama Allah, oua alard Hitler.*”

(“No more Monsieur, no more Mister  
In heaven Allah, on earth Hitler.”)

And if he wishes to find documents reporting on this, let him look up—because his memory might fail him—in the course of this evening, the collection of documents by Raoul Aglion called *The Fighting French*, published in New York in 1943.

131. There is something wrong with our Organization if the representative of Syria can get up, as he did yesterday [1972nd meeting], and say to all of us: “I know this young intruder who took a position on this podium. I know him as a member of the JDL, as a Jew”—at a time when he knew or should have known already that the young man was not Jewish, that his name was McColgan, that he came

here without any thought of saying anything remotely connected with the Middle East situation, that he came here to speak of China. The representative of Syria criticized yesterday the expressions of international concern for the plight of Jews in his country. How could it have been otherwise? How could the international community, organized here in the United Nations, and the press, organizations and individuals not be concerned about the tragedy of the Syrian Jews, the small remnant of an ancient and proud community, altogether only 4,500 of them? What is their state? We have heard some indication of it being quoted by the representative of Syria himself, when he read out the statement made on a local radio station. These Jews live in ghettos in the twentieth century. They are not allowed to move more than one and a half miles from their homes. They are not allowed to have telephones in their homes. They are not allowed to have bank accounts. They are not allowed to exercise free professions. They are not allowed to communicate with the outside world. They are not allowed, even when they die, to pass on their possessions in heritage to their children. These Jews live under the constant threat of persecution and interrogation and of torture of those that are in prison. In one town, Al Qamishli, every Jewish person has to report to the police station every single day. Among the Syrian textbooks still used today in Syrian schools, the compulsory reading book for children in the first grade of the elementary schools begins with the sentence: "All Jews are criminals and should be eliminated." This is the situation that the representative of Syria here describes as being one of protection and vindication of human rights. This is the situation he wants the United Nations to accept as being of no concern to the international community.

132. As for the plight of Soviet Jewry, the very story on which the representative of the Ukrainian SSR dwelt today symbolizes the profoundness of the tragedy of Jews in the Soviet Union—the story of Babi Yar. Let me speak through the words of a Soviet poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, who wrote:

*There are no memorials over Babi Yar—  
The steep slope is the only gravestone.  
I am afraid.  
Today I am as old as the Jewish people.  
It seems to me now that I am a Jew.  
Now I am wandering in Ancient Egypt.  
And now, crucified on the cross, I die  
And to this very day I bear the marks of the nails.  
It seems to me that I am Dreyfus.  
The worthy citizenry denounces me and judges me.  
I am behind prison bars.  
I am trapped, hunted, spat upon, reviled  
And good ladies in dresses flounced with Brussels lace  
Shrieking, poke umbrellas in my face.  
It seems to me that I am a boy in Byelostok,  
Blood flows and spreads across the floor.  
Reeking of onion and vodka  
...  
Booted aside, I am helpless:  
I plead with the pogrom thugs.  
To roars of 'Beat the Yids, and save Russia',  
A shopkeeper is beating up my mother.  
O my Russian people!  
You are really international at heart.*

*But the unclean  
Have often loudly taken in vain  
Your most pure name*

*...  
Wild grasses rustle over Babi Yar.  
The trees look down sternly, like judges.  
Everything here shrieks silently  
And, taking off my cap,  
I sense that I am turning gray.  
And I myself am nothing but a silent shriek,  
Over the thousands and thousands buried in this place.  
I am every old man who was shot here.  
I am every boy who was shot here.  
No part of me will ever forget any of this.  
Let the 'Internationale' ring out  
When the last anti-Semite on earth is buried.  
There is no Jewish blood in mine,  
But I am hated by every anti-Semite as Jew,  
And for this reason,  
I am a true Russian.\**

133. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR told us of a decision by his Government to establish a monument also in Babi Yar. The tragedy of Babi Yar, when Jews were led out of Kiev, 80,000 of them, to be shot and buried there by the Germans, took place in 1941, 30 years ago. In Babi Yar today there is a small tablet saying what the representative of the Ukrainian SSR informed us his Government intends to do. It says: "Here in this spot there will be built a monument in memory of Soviet people the victims of fascism." I say it is in this kind of inscription, not only in the fact that it took 30 years to put it up, that the very quintessence of the tragedy of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union lies.

134. There are many Babi Yars in the Soviet Union. I remember one of them near the town of Vilnius. I visited it. It is in a forest outside the town, a forest called Ponara. There is a monument there on which is inscribed: "Here 90,000 victims were murdered by the Nazi invaders." As you walk around the monument you see trenches—today they are covered by grass, but you can still see them there—in which the people were shot and buried, men women and children. On top of every trench there is a small sign: "Here 10,000 Soviet soldiers were killed"; "Here 20,000 men, women and children were murdered". As you walk around this monument, you suddenly realize that something is missing. Eighty thousand Jews, Soviet citizens, were killed there for being Jews, and the word "Jew" does not appear on a single tablet. Then you enter a little museum in Ponara, near Vilnius, and you begin to walk around the room. On its walls there are photographs of these unfortunates being led to their death, photographs taken by a guard of the railroad crossing through which those convoys of death had to pass—photographs hidden until the end of the war and then presented to the Soviet authorities. You look at these photographs of the men, women and children being led out of the town of Vilnius to their death and you see the yellow Star of David on each one of them, and you look at their faces and you see Jewish faces and Jewish eyes. And you walk around this room,

\* Evgeni Yevtushenko, "Babi Yar", translated by Max Hayward, in Patricia Blake and Max Hayward, *Dissonant Voices in Soviet Literature* (New York, Pantheon Books, 1962), pp. 260-261.

look at these scores of photographs, look at the documents and the inscriptions under them and suddenly you realize that this entire museum does not have one word saying that these were Jews who were being murdered by the Nazis, not simply because they were Soviet men, women and children, not because they were fighting men or prisoners of war but because they were Jews. And that is the tragedy of the remnant of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union today: the denial of their identity, the denial of their right to live as Jews, the denial of their Jewish identity even in death, even when they were murdered by our common enemy, the Nazis.

135. I need not speak for Soviet Jews; they speak for themselves. I should like to read out a letter which I transmitted some time ago to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a letter addressed to him by a young man from Kiev, the capital of the Ukrainian SSR, whose representative spoke here a while ago. The letter reads as follows:

"I am a Jew. I want to live in the Jewish State. This is my right, just as it is the right of a Ukrainian to live in the Ukraine, the right of a Russian to live in Russia, the right of a Georgian to live in Georgia.

"I want to live in Israel.

"This is my dream; this is the goal not only of my life but also of the lives of hundreds of generations which preceded me, of my ancestors who were expelled from their land.

"I want my children to study in a school in the Hebrew language. I want to read Jewish papers; I want to attend a Jewish theatre. What's wrong with that? What is my crime? Most of my relatives were shot by the Fascists. My father perished and his parents were killed. Were they alive now, they would be standing at my side: Let me go!

"I have repeatedly turned with this request to various authorities and have achieved only this: dismissal from my job, my wife's expulsion from her Institute; and, to crown it all, a criminal charge of slandering Soviet reality. What is this slander? Is it slander that in the multinational Soviet State only the Jewish people cannot educate its children in Jewish schools? Is it slander that there is no Jewish theatre in the USSR? Is it slander that in the USSR there are no Jewish papers? By the way, no one even denies this. Perhaps it is slander that for over a year I have not succeeded in obtaining an exit permit for Israel? Or is it slander that nobody wants to speak to me, that there is nobody to complain to? Nobody reacts. But even this isn't the heart of the matter. I don't want to be involved in the national affairs of a State in which I consider myself an alien. I want to go away from here. I want to live in Israel. My wish does not contradict Soviet law . . .

"I am not asking for mercy. Listen to the voice of reason:

"Let me go!

"As long as I live, as long as I am capable of feeling, I shall devote all my strength to obtain an exit permit for Israel. And even if you should find it possible to sentence me for this—I shall anyway, if I live long enough to be freed, be prepared even then to make my way even on foot to the homeland of my ancestors."

(Signed) "Kochubiyevsky"

This young man is in prison today, till this very day, simply because he wanted to live as a Jew.

136. In the course of the last few months I have submitted a great number of appeals from Jewish people in the Soviet Union to the General Assembly, to the Secretary-General, to the Commission on Human Rights, asking to be allowed to reunite with their families, to join their people in Israel, in the Jewish State. Only a few weeks ago I submitted such an appeal signed by more than 500 Jews from the Soviet Union. In between the signatures of that appeal these words appeared repeatedly: "Israel or death".

137. What else do the representatives of the USSR, of the Ukrainian SSR, need to persuade them of the gravity of the tragedy of these millions of Jews who remain in the Soviet Union? What else is necessary to persuade them that there is a grave problem and that the only way to deal with it is in accordance with our Charter, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to grant them the right to leave and to live as Jews in the Jewish State?

138. Finally, a word about a point which has been raised here repeatedly by Soviet representatives, especially when they try to justify their attacks against my people and against Zionism, our national liberation movement. This is the argument that goes: "Perhaps 23 years ago we supported the State of Israel, we supported the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, but the State of Israel has changed its policies; the national liberation movement today is bent on aggression"—I think I heard that somewhere—"and that is why we have changed". No, history cannot be rewritten in political statements, made at this podium. We did not declare war on the Arab States in 1948. We were invaded by the Arab States in 1948. They declared war on us. They refused to make peace with us for 23 years. If they were the aggressors, as the Soviet representatives Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Malik himself stated here in the United Nations in 1948 and 1949, the fact that we were successful in repulsing that aggression, in surviving under its impact for 23 years, in pushing back the Arab armies, does not change the historic truth that aggression remains aggression, no matter what the political winds in one capital or another make certain Governments think about circumstances at a particular juncture. No, Ambassador Malik, we did not change; you did, your Government did. For in 1948 you stood by the Charter of the United Nations; you recognized the right of my people to national liberation and to freedom and independence; you supported us, you spoke of Arab aggression. And today you identify yourself unreservedly and blindly with the continuation of Arab belligerency against us. We have not changed, we are still struggling for our existence, we are still struggling for the recognition of our neighbours to our right to independence. And the fact that we are doing it successfully at a high price of suffering and sacrifice does not change historic truth.

139. But I think you too will change, because I know that the spirit which is reflected in Yevgeny Yevtushenko's poem will overcome, will prevail, will last longer than some of the outbursts of hostility, of hatred and of abuse to which we have been treated in the last few days.

140. I know that even in the Soviet Union there are people of goodwill who in the end will prevail, so that all of us—including Israel and its Arab neighbours—will be able to live, at long last, in fraternal neighbourhood, in peace and security.

141. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Nobody should condone intolerance towards the adherents of any religion, including Judaism.

142. Mr. Tekoah has said that the Jews have been persecuted since before the Romans—I believe he had in mind Nebuchadnezzar—and throughout history; he could perhaps have said until the First World War, or, in theory, until the French Revolution. But we are not here going into the historical background of religious intolerance.

143. There was religious intolerance until very recently in history. Indeed there are still some areas where people practise religious intolerance as a vestige of the past. However, I must bring to the attention of our colleagues here that there was religious intolerance between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church and within the Catholic Church. We know about the Inquisition. There was religious intolerance after Protestantism was established, between Protestants and Catholics. And there was also religious intolerance against the Jews, but not solely against the Jews. Religious intolerance was rampant in past centuries.

144. But Mr. Tekoah is confusing the issue. He wants to turn back the hands of the clock. He wants to make a nation out of a religion. That was tried by Christianity, the two branches of Christianity, at one time: Rome and Constantinople, the Roman Empire and Byzantium.

145. Then we find that, when nationalism became rife, people of one faith fought others of the same faith: Catholics fought Catholics, as peoples; Protestants fought Protestants; and Catholics and Protestants sometimes fought against Catholics, or against Protestants.

146. In Islam, there is no single Islamic nation; there is no such thing as an Islamic race. Moslem countries have been known in very recent times to have fought one another. And this is where, I submit, Mr. Tekoah is confusing the issue.

147. The Jews are not a race; nor are the Jews one people. Mr. Tekoah wants to make of all the Jews one people, one race. That is why I said he is turning back the hands of the clock. It does not work. But why is he doing that? Because he and others, the leaders of political Zionism, are using this noble religion, which is a monotheistic religion, as a motivation for political and economic ends. That is why he wants to consider every Jew as belonging to one race.

148. The Sephardic Jews are sometimes pitch dark, like the blacks, and I have known European Jews who were

blond. We know what the principal races are. Anthropologists tell us. It is not just Baroody telling you. There is the white race, sometimes called Caucasian or Indo-European. There is the black race. There is the yellow race. There is what is known as the Red-Indian race, which is probably affiliated to the Mongolians of Asia. There are the aborigines of New Zealand, Australia, New Guinea and West Irian. Those are the principal races.

149. I submit that there is no such thing as a pure race because the races, we are told even by the ethnologists, have been mixed. And can Mr. Tekoah tell us this: if a Jewish mother begets a child of a gentile father, a non-Jewish father, what race does he belong to?

150. It is a question of adherence to a religion, opting for a faith, not tampering with the findings of anthropology and ethnology. So in an oratorical manner Mr. Tekoah, here and in other organs of the United Nations, is working from the wrong premises. His premises are invalid. There is no such thing as a Jewish race.

151. Then we come to peoples. A people may be a people in the cultural and political sense, like the American people. They may be white; they may be black; they may be a mixture—mulattoes; they may be Puerto Ricans, they may be Hawaiians; but they form the American people. There are many religions in America, and there is a lack of religion in America. Some do not believe in any God, like the members of the Communist Party, who are atheists. We have heard from the representative of the Soviet Union that they do not prevent other people from practising their religions. What I am saying applies also to the people of the Soviet Union, but I am living in the host country and have been here for three decades, so I must know a little about the United States. There are Catholics, there are Protestants, and there are all kinds of other Christian sects—I do not want to enumerate them. There are about 150 religions in California alone. And there are Jews, but the Jews also are of different sects and those Jews may have been mixed with other races, because sex is stronger than religion, I must tell Mr. Tekoah.

152. If a Christian falls in love with a Jewish girl he forgets all about his religion. The rabbi says, "Well, now"—they are practical—"Let us make him a Jew." Does he become of a different race when he becomes a Jew? That is the question. Whom do you think you are fooling here, Mr. Tekoah? Talk scientifically, not rhetorically, using polemics. I do not know a word of Russian. You may be quoting Russian to show your pedantry, your knowledge of Russian literature. But a Russian told me, "He is not quoting it right." I said, "I do not know. He may be or he may not be. I do not know anything about Russian." You are confusing the issues, Mr. Tekoah, and this is not the first time you have done it. I submit that Jews are not of one race.

153. Secondly, I submit that the Jews do not constitute a single people, but by force, by indoctrination, by setting the hands of the clock back, Mr. Tekoah wants to make a nationality out of a religion, and we tell him that historically this has backfired. I know from Jews in this country that they want to identify themselves wholly with America. They have no loyalty to Israel. And they are

blackmailed when they do not buy the Israeli bonds. That is why the United States is becoming insolvent, sending out dollars, which I saw floating like butterflies in Europe this last summer.

154. And the 78 American Senators, they like the votes. The 78 Senators were brainwashed, but not really brainwashed. They know how the Zionists through the mass media get them votes. My dear Mr. Shepard, you are an astronaut and it would have been better if you had kept to the moon and not come down to this earth.

155. Whom do they think they are fooling?

156. Then Mr. Tekoah talks to us about "the human rights of Jews". If one says "the human rights of everybody, including the Jews", that is understandable, but this is singling out the human rights of Jews, as if they had a particular kind of human rights and others had a different brand. The other day, Mr. Tekoah deplored the fact that many people still believed in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. I for one, as a humble researcher, do not want to commit myself one way or the other, because if I were to open this question it would be very controversial. However, one Jew—and he was a non-Zionist Jew; he was not a Russian Jew anyway, but an American Jew—told me, "Those Zionists behave as if the Protocols of the Elders of Zion were true." I am not going into details. I am quoting because Mr. Tekoah quoted many people here.

157. Then he talks about, not "the human rights" but "the rights"—he took away the word "human"—"of the Jewish people in all the world." The other day, at the 1581st meeting of the Security Council, I asked that a poll should be taken to find out whether the Jews dispersed all over the world would prefer to consider the capitals of their respective countries as their own capitals or whether they preferred to consider Jerusalem as their capital. This is important for us Arabs, to know how many Jews in the world would like to consider Israel as their country, because, after all, if Palestine were to receive Jews from all over the world it would mean expansion. We are asking that, not just for the sake of statistics, but to see where we stand. If the Soviet Union, which has 3 million Jews, were to chase out the Jews—which it does not do, because many Jews do not want to leave the Soviet Union—it would mean that Gyrria would be occupied; and not just the Sinai Peninsula but part of the Egyptian delta would also have to be occupied. There are 15 or 16 million Jews.

158. I submit that the Jews who are not Zionists are loyal to their country of birth or adoption, but Mr. Tekoah calls them "my people". I know Mr. Javits, the Senator, very well. I do not know whether he should be a Senator of Israel or a Senator of the United States, because, whether he likes it or not, Mr. Tekoah considers him as one of his people. What is he, a legislator of the United States or a legislator of Israel? Let us set the record clear, and let the Americans find out, because they do not know what or whom they are supporting or not supporting.

159. Mr. Tekoah wishes to ingather all the Jews of various nationalities, whether they like it or not, into Palestine, not by force or compulsion, but by repeating to them, "You are the chosen people of God. You are a different breed of

men"—which, as I said, ethnologically and racially is incorrect and invalid—"you should all be ingathered into Palestine", the Palestine which the European Zionists usurp. I said "European Zionists" because zionism is not an Oriental Jewish movement, but a movement by the Khazars, who were converted to Judaism in the seventh century A.D. and who came from the northern tier of Asia and are known to have been of Turco-Finnish origin. They were converted, just as St. Augustine converted the British. But that does not make the British who embraced the Christian religion Semites.

160. Then Mr. Tekoah spoke about anti-Semitism. Look at my cranium, which is Semitic, and look at my nose; and then look at the head of Mr. Tekoah. He looks like a Russian to me. Yet he says I am an anti-Semite. There is no doubt that some of the tribes that lived, in the first century, in what today is known as Russia have become Russians; so have the Ukrainians, for that matter, and any other Russians. And there is nothing wrong with that. But those Russians, whether they are theists or atheists, do not say, "We are the chosen people of God." In fact, some of them deny God altogether. But some of them still go to church, I have heard, and burn candles before the icons. I think the Soviet Union is wise to let them worship, because religion is something very deep in man because of his preoccupation with death; he wants to believe that he is going to survive after he dies. But I am not speaking about eschatology; I am talking about Mr. Tekoah's statements, which are unscientific, rhetorical and polemical. He thinks that there will be so many people listening to him on television that he will be able to whip up the frenzy of the Zionists; and then next time, I do not know from what roof they will begin shooting bullets.

161. And here, parenthetically, I am addressing the United States. Is that Ambassador Bush sitting there? I am addressing the United States. The United States has, to a large extent, adopted Anglo-Saxon law. This is not parenthetical, it is relevant. In Anglo-Saxon law, the instigator or inciter is an abettor in any crime which he incites or instigates. I remember how, in the United Kingdom, a certain gangster wanted to kill a policeman, so he chose a boy of 14 or 15. You may remember that; it made news in the United Kingdom. That gangster told the boy of 14 or 15, "This is the policeman who is harassing us. Shoot him", and he pointed him out. The boy killed the poor policeman. The boy was not touched. Of course, he was sent to a correctional school. But who was hanged? They had capital punishment then, the British, and they hanged the one who instigated the boy to kill.

162. But here—out of fairness to the Zionists—not all of them want violence; only that faction of them who think they can get away with violence. There are other factions also, non-Jewish, gentiles, who believe in zionism and who think that they can, in this country, instigate and incite people to commit crimes and still get off scot-free. Where is the Anglo-Saxon law that I thought permeated the American legal system? I would like to ask our American friends to look into this. We do not interfere in their internal affairs. Far be it from us to be the arbiters of what they should do. But after all, our lives here are affected by all this, and the lives of our families and our children. We are intimidated.

163. I close the parenthesis. We now go back to Mr. Tekoah.

164. Mr. Tekoah said that the Jews of the world are "his people". Should any Jew who comes to the United States, like any other immigrant nowadays, ask the permission of Mr. Tekoah's Government, to know whether he should come and try to build his fortune in the United States, or in any other country, for that matter? This has implications. Does it not make it difficult for Jews when they play on their sentiments, saying: "What are we? We are Jews. We are told every day we are Jews, we are Jews, we are Jews. Our loyalty should be to whom? To the country of our birth or adoption, or to this usurping State of Israel?" You are causing a conflict, Mr. Tekoah, in the hearts of Jews. You are deluding them, deceiving them. I am sure you are doing it unwittingly, blindly. You have repeated that psychosis to yourself, that you are the chosen people of God, that you were chosen in Palestine. Yet most of your leaders nowadays come from Central Europe and originated there. We, the peoples of the area, consider this a simple, colonial incursion into our midst. It is just like the Crusades in the Middle Ages, in the year 1095. The Crusades were a political movement, though the motivation was religious. I mentioned the other day that those Crusaders, those who nourished the idea that the Holy Sepulchre should, in the words of Peter the Hermit, be wrested from the hands of the infidel, thought "Maybe we are not succeeding because the men we are sending there are sinners. Let us send a crusade of children." Then the children who went on the Children's Crusade they sold, on the way, into slavery. This is history.

165. All that happened in the past. But this is a colonial incursion motivated by the distortion of a noble religion. You cannot make a race out of a religion, nor can you make a nationality out of a religion. Buddha was born in Nepal, which was part of India, 500 years or so before Christ. Have the Chinese, the adherents of Buddha—the People's Republic of China or the China of the Emperors—ever claimed that Nepal should be a province of China because Buddha was born there? I never heard anybody except the political Zionists say that, because the prophets of Judaism flourished in Palestine, Palestine should therefore be theirs. They used to say, "God gave us Palestine"; but they do not say it any more because—they say—"Baroodi will ask us to produce the title deed". Where is the title deed with the seal showing that God gave them Palestine? I say that God is not in the real estate business.

166. Remember what David said in one of the Psalms: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." He did not specify parts of it. Those of you who believe in God, and those who do not believe in God, laugh at any such assertion—laugh at any God for that matter. And they want to recreate freedom. I am mentioning Mr. Tekoah's words, which I jotted down: "...recreate our freedom in that little piece of land", Palestine.

167. To recreate your freedom you flock from the outside—at whose expense? At the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine, many of whom may have been Jews who embraced Christianity or Islam. My family existed before Islam. Some of us are Moslems and some of us happen to be Christians—these, because we were Chris-

tian before we embraced Islam. I have not yet found a Jewish Baroodi; maybe I shall one day.

168. Therefore, we come again and again to the conclusion that political Zionism is a movement which has used a noble monotheistic religion as a motivation for a political and economic end.

169. And let me forthwith explain why we Arabs are so apprehensive. We are really in a fever because, like the Crusaders before them, the Zionists constitute a foreign element in the body politic and the body social of the Middle East, as the Crusaders had done before, when this foreign element caused an abscess; and this explains our fever. I am using a figure of speech. This is why you should know why we Arabs are in such a state of ferment.

170. Then every time he invokes the episode of the Second World War which brought untold suffering to Jew and gentile; 60 million people perished in the Second World War. I have heard Mr. Malik since 1948, 1949 or 1950, mention that the Soviet Union had lost 20 million people. This is most deplorable. And then there were those who were maimed, the living who were bereaved. And no doubt the Jews lost many. But I do not find the Russians or, for that matter, the Germans, who lost about 10 million, crying over their dead. The dead are dead, may God rest their souls in peace. And other people have died; if they do not die by man's hand, they die by nature. Do Hitler's excesses in Europe justify Zionists coming from abroad and usurping the homeland of the indigenous people of Palestine and perpetrating tragedies against Palestine? The Jews rationalize this by telling us that they have to go to their homeland because the prophets of Judaism originated over 2,000 years ago in the area when it was known as the land of Canaan, before our Jews came from Mesopotamia, before the Chaldees. Let Mr. Tekoah study the Bible, or, if he does not have the time because he is engrossed in words, there are many Jewish scholars who will bear out what I am telling you here and telling him. Do not let him get away with what he says rhetorically.

171. And then he says: "You Syrians"—my Syrian colleague will speak for himself and for his country—"you even had certain folk songs." And I must say he could improve his Arabic a little because Mr. Tekoah's progeny may one day be assimilated as we Arabs assimilated the Crusaders. He was reciting Arabic in transliterated English, which shows he is not even of the area. But this is very simple—some people had a song in the streets of Damascus. I had never heard it until today in transliterated English, this song he recited about Hitler: "God in heaven and Hitler on earth." The Arabs were so bitter at the British, at Balfour, the crook. Balfour told Sir Ronald Storrs—who, incidentally, was an Arabist in Cairo—but do not feel guilty; that was the past generation—when Sir Ronald said that this document which came to be known as the Balfour Declaration was a problem, Balfour said (and I am paraphrasing): "Young man, this is a great experiment for the British Empire." Not for the beauty of the eyes of the Jews. Where is the British Empire now? Anything that is based on injustice is bound to go down the drain, like the British Empire.

172. And they were so bitter, those Damascenes, after having seen those Khazars from Eastern Europe massacring

the Arabs of Palestine—and, in fairness to them, being massacred themselves by the Arabs—that they said: “If Hitler can solve the Jewish problem we shall be happy.”

173. Well, I shall remind you of what Mr. Churchill said; it is known, it is in his book. Somebody asked him (and I am paraphrasing again): “How can you, a Tory”—or of the Conservative Party, to put it mildly—“tolerate your country’s being allied to the Soviet Union during the Second World War?” And Mr. Churchill retorted: “I will ally myself with the devil if I can beat Hitler.” So if Churchill, descended from the Marlboroughs, the aristocracy of the United Kingdom, said that, why should not the man in the street have a song: “May God strengthen Hitler if he makes good riddance for me and the people of Palestine of the Jews.” This is emotionalism; this is not right. You cannot judge a people when they are bitter, when they are being massacred and persecuted, simply by certain flippant songs that are sung by the masses.

174. I have wondered for the last 50 years why the Zionists should act so strangely, and I came to the conclusion that the answer was what a Jew once told me. He said: “Look, my friend Jamil, we Jews thrive on persecution.” I said, “How?” He said, “When we are persecuted there is a challenge for us, and as a minority we try to overcome it, but we have to have a motivation—that we are always persecuted. And then we believe we are always persecuted.”

175. And Mr. Tekoah cast aspersions on the Soviet Union about its maltreatment of Jews. But he has forgotten that many of the Communists that were with Lenin were Jews. He has forgotten that there are nowadays many Jews who receive the Lenin Prize for their achievements. No, he wants to see what he sees; he is like a horse with blinkers, and the road lies straight ahead. He does not see anything on the sides. He wants 3 million Jews from the Soviet Union to come to Palestine, and if Mr. Malik does not persuade his Government that it should do so, then they will ask Baroody to tell the Soviet Union to do so.

176. Listen to this. This is a telegram I received today. Here it is, Mr. President. It is an authentic one. This is not the protocol of Zionists.

“Mr. Baroody, you are a hypocrite;”—you should see the curses sometimes I receive from the belly-button down; this is nothing—“tell Kosygin to let my people go.”

Good Lord, we do not have relations with the Soviet Union. Being an Arab I have the ear of the Soviet Union, and sometimes I remonstrate with poor Ambassador Malik, but I do not want to tell you what I remonstrate with him on. We all remonstrate with one another on the policies of the Soviet Union or the United States or what have you.

177. I, a hypocrite? Look how emotional this is. They want me to interfere with Kosygin, assuming that they thought Saudi Arabia had diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. How would I intercede with Kosygin, when they call me a hypocrite? You see the emotionalism? This is the emotionalism of Mr. Tekoah—“My people”: this is one of “his people” living in Brooklyn.

178. If certain Jews, not all Jews, have a persecution complex, we should send them to the Jewish psychiatrist—

and most psychiatrists are Jews in this town—to liberate them from that persecution by which they have been tormented since time immemorial. And let us find those factors, and I believe—I am not a psychoanalyst, but I studied a little in my younger days—maybe the psychiatrists can liberate them and then the Jews could act freely like every other American here. I am talking only of the Zionists, not the non-Zionist Jews. The non-Zionist Jews are normal. The non-Zionist Russian Jews are normal. The non-Zionist French Jews are normal and also the Sephardic Jews—most of whom call me every now and then to tell me, “What have they done to us, those Zionists?” I say, “They are your co-religionists”, but they say, “They are our co-religionists? They are Khazars; they are not from the area.” I say, “I could not persuade them for the last 50 years. How would you like me to persuade them?” They have a complex. Let them go and visit a psychiatrist and get rid of that complex: “because we are Jews we have been persecuted; we should have special rights; we should have a land based on the promise of God that we will return to Israel.” And they are still waiting also for the Messiah. That is their privilege, but not at the expense of the indigenous people of the country who have lived there when they were Jews. Not all the Jews left Palestine; not all the Jews during the days of Hitler left Germany; otherwise there would not have been so many to be burned. Only the wealthy Jews left Germany; and only the wealthy and influential Jews left Palestine when it was a province of the Roman Empire. Perhaps some of those Jews are now Christians; maybe some of them are Moslems. They are the indigenous people of Palestine—not by religion but by ethnology and by culture.

179. And here he tells us: “You anti-Semites.” We are the Semites. Can we be against ourselves? Arabs are anti-Semites? That is the “payoff”, to use another American slang expression.

180. The Zionists seem to have ears, but they do not hear; and they seem to have eyes, but they do not see. And I am not saying this in derision or with any hatred or rancour. Believe me, whether they are Zionists or non-Zionists, to me people of any religion or of no religion are human beings. There is the common bond of humanity between us all, which should transcend this petty nationalism that is predicated on ideology or on religion or on any political philosophy, for that matter.

181. I say that advisedly, because the Zionists have made a world issue of this persecution complex, a complex the central theme of which is that everyone who is a Jew should conform to what the Israeli Government prescribes. I repeat, that complex is predicated on the thesis that if you are a Jew, no matter where you are, you should conform to all that the Israeli Government prescribes.

182. The motto of the Zionists, whether in the Soviet Union or in the Arab countries, where there are Sephardic Jews, is, “Let me go, let me go.” We do not tell the Palestinians in Palestine to adopt a motto, “leave us alone, leave us alone.”

183. Those stereotyped phrases to fire the imagination of people are in the nature of rhetoric. “Let my people go!” What people? The American Jews? The Russian Jews?

The French Jews? Jews, wherever they are, should go to Israel? No. They say, "Let them go." But finally the apparatus of information will not leave them alone, until they drive them crazy and they will have to go to Palestine.

184. On behalf of the Palestinians I might say here: "Leave us alone; for Heaven's sake, leave us alone."

185. The Charter of the United Nations which Mr. Tekoah alludes to did not give Palestine to the Zionists to partition. It was by pressures and corrupt methods that Palestine was partitioned. The Charter guaranteed the principle of self-determination. In 1947 the United Nations and its membership—and I was present at that session—violated the Charter by setting aside the right of the indigenous people of Palestine to self-determination, and permitted an alien people from eastern Europe, who happened to be Jews, to come and establish themselves under a false motivation in the Holy Land, which has been desecrated by violence, blood and suffering.

186. There will be no peace in Palestine, no matter how rhetorical Mr. Tekoah and his ilk can be, unless the Jews who are moved by true religious sentiment choose to live there not under the political flag of zionism but as real brothers and sisters of the indigenous people of Palestine, who have always been noted for being hospitable to strangers.

187. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In reply to the statement by the representative of Israel, only one thing can be said. His remarks were, as always, completely saturated with slander, anti-sovietism and anti-arabism, on the one hand, and, on the other, with racist demagoguery and a pathological hatred of other peoples.

188. This sums up all the statements I have heard from the Israeli representative in my three and a half years in the Security Council, the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations. It is very important to remember that the present Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, Mr. Tekoah, already during his term as Israeli Ambassador to the Soviet Union, stood out as a foreigner who was pathologically hostile towards the Soviet Union.

189. A recently published Russian book, *Zionism, the Poisoned Weapon of Imperialism*, mentions one of Tekoah's feats while in the Soviet Union:

"The Israeli Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Y. Tekoah, had come with J. Katz, Third Secretary of Embassy, to Odessa"—a city on the Black Sea. "The first thing they did was to go to the bazaar where, posing as tourists, they gathered a group of idlers around their automobile and began to praise life in Israel to the skies. The diplomats also distributed Zionist literature and various trinkets to everyone around, which was supposed to convince the crowd of the prosperity of 'the Promised Land'.

"For two days the diplomats toured Odessa. On the streets and in the restaurants and shops they gave out anti-Soviet Zionist brochures in the guise of souvenirs."s

<sup>s</sup> *Sionizm—Otravlennoe oruzhie imperializma* (Moscow, Izdatelstvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1970), p. 144.

190. That was the behaviour of a foreign ambassador to the Soviet Union. I do not suppose that any one present at this distinguished meeting of ambassadors—and there are very many ambassadors present here—would consider such behaviour by an Israeli Ambassador to the Soviet Union to be suitable.

191. Mr. Tekoah bandied about the term "anti-Semitism", and even ascribed anti-Semitism to the Soviet Union. His slander about Babi Yar has already been brilliantly exposed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Ukraine, Comrade Shevel, in his statement.

192. I wish firmly and most categorically to expose and reject the slander concerning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. There is no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. But there is anti-zionism. These are two quite different things; they are two absolutely different phenomena.

193. Since the time when I was a student, some of my closest friends have been, and remain, Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality. We, the post-revolutionary generation in the Soviet Union, were raised by the party of Lenin in the spirit of internationalism and of respect for all peoples and nations of the earth, and we have no prejudices or preconceptions about any nationality or people, including the Jewish people. But, having suffered Churchill's intervention following the October Revolution, Hitler's invasion and the encirclement of the Soviet Union in an attempt to stifle it, we hate aggressors with every fibre of our being. We sacrificed 20 million of our best sons and daughters to uphold our freedom and independence and the sovereignty of our homeland. We performed a great historic feat: we saved ourselves and the world from the Fascist plague. We saved Jews throughout the world.

194. Shame on you, Mr. Tekoah, for having come to this high rostrum to slander us, the great Soviet Union and its fraternal family of peoples, with over 130 nationalities living together as brothers. This could have been done only by a man who has lost his common sense and is imbued with a pathological hatred for our country. And Tekoah is just such a type.

195. As regards zionism, I can say quite openly to the whole General Assembly that it is true that we are anti-Zionist, but we are not anti-Semitic. Mr. Tekoah distorts facts, plays with words, speculates on the historical past and on the sufferings of the Jewish people. He tries to assert that anti-Semitism and anti-zionism are identical concepts. He deliberately conceals and covers up the radical difference between those two phenomena.

196. What is zionism?

197. The essence of this racist ideology was brilliantly illustrated and exposed in the statement made yesterday [1973rd meeting] by our colleague the Permanent Representative of Syria, Mr. Tomeh. There is little I can add to what was said by that great and learned student of zionism. Zionism is anti-Fascist in word, but is shamelessly Fascist and racist in deed.

198. Wherever they can do so, and from this rostrum, the Zionists and their representative, Tekoah, declare that they

have always been and remain implacable enemies of fascism and Hitlerism. But that is nothing more than a deliberately contrived legend which the ringleaders of Israeli zionism use in an attempt to mask their true countenance. In reality, the facts are just the opposite. The Zionists have always been and remain the spiritual brothers, successors and disciples of the Fascists and the racists.

199. The Fascist and the Zionist have the same ideological character. Both express the interests of the imperialist and most reactionary upper-*bourgeoisie*. Both are mortal enemies of the revolutionary and national liberation movement, enemies of socialism and communism. Both are inveterate racists. The only difference is that the German Fascists created the cult of the "Aryan master race" whereas the Zionists are trying to create a cult of the "Jewish super-race" That is the only difference.

200. Here is documentary evidence from *The Spectator* of 21 August 1971:

"From a preface to a textbook of Jewish philosophy as taught in Israeli schools now"—I stress the word "now"—"with full approval of the Ministry of Education:"—I stress "Ministry of Education"—"The Jewish nation is the chosen nation by its race, its education and the climate of the land where it had developed.'"6

Mr. Tekoah tried to say from this rostrum that the concept of a "chosen people" is a religious one dating back to distant Biblical times. Here is an explanation in a textbook used in Jewish schools of what the chosen people is:

"The race of the Jewish people is the best of all races, because it was formed by choosing the best in each generation. Adam, created by God himself, was completely perfect. Adam had many sons and the best of them was Seth. He was chosen to continue the race of Adam till the formation of the Jewish nation. Seth had many sons and the best of them was Enos . . ."6

And so on and so forth. That is documentary proof. What do the Zionists teach in Israeli schools? They teach hatred for other peoples and the elevation of the Jewish nation into a super-nation.

201. How does that differ from the philosophy of the German Fascists, who preached the cult of the Aryan nation, tried to make it the ruler of the world, and taught in similar philosophical works that all other nations should be turned into manure for fertilizing the Aryan nation?

202. That is why we say there is no substantial difference between the racism of German fascism and the racism of Israeli zionism.

203. As has already been repeatedly said and demonstrated, zionism is a racist ideology. The tales and legends of all kinds about the exclusiveness of Jews are nothing more than a naïve religious fiction, which today the ideologues of zionism are making the basis of the misanthropic racist ideology and policy of Israel.

204. Mr. Tekoah read out here an obviously forged letter from a Zionist in the Soviet Union. Apparently we too have

some Zionists, perhaps even an Israeli "fifth column". And Tekoah undoubtedly helped to implant zionism when he was Ambassador to the USSR. He referred to the case of a supposedly Jewish girl, a student who was expelled from an institute. But for bad behaviour or poor progress our institutes can expel any student—of Jewish, Russian, Ukrainian, Georgian or any other nationality. To put this forward as a fact proving the oppression of the Jews, when it proves absolutely nothing, is to say the least unworthy of the high office of representative of a State Member of the United Nations.

205. I could quote from many other letters from Soviet Jews in answer to the slander of the Zionists. Here is a letter filled with indignation and anger, written by a Soviet citizen of Jewish nationality, Doctor D. Sheintsvit. He writes:

"The slanderous inventions of Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir to the effect that anti-Semitism reigns in the Soviet Union and that Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are oppressed, and her statement to the effect that the homeland of all Jews should be Israel, aroused deep indignation and anger among Soviet Jews. Soviet Jews are bound by indissoluble ties to their only homeland, the Soviet Union."

206. Among the closest assistants and true disciples of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin were some outstanding leaders of Jewish nationality. The first President of the Soviet Union was a Jew—Comrade Sverdlov.

"Thousands and thousands of sons of the Jewish people, together with sons of other peoples in our country,"—the Soviet Jew's letter continues—"gave their lives during the Patriotic War for the honour, freedom and independence of their homeland. In time of peace too, Soviet Jews work actively and with dedication in all spheres of the economy, science, literature and art.

"The names of Jewish scientists, outstanding writers and poets, composers, workers in the theatre and the cinema, and chess players are well known. Through their work they are contributing to the prosperity and glory of their Soviet homeland. The whole life and activities of Soviet Jews provide convincing evidence of the depth of their roots in the land in which they were born and raised. That land is their only homeland; they had, have and can have no other."

That is the reply of a Soviet Jew to the slanderer Tekoah. Tekoah claimed that Jews in the Soviet Union are denied education. That is a scandalous lie. I categorically reject that slanderous fabrication. I shall give two figures. The percentage of the total population studying at higher and secondary educational establishments is 1.82; the percentage of Jews studying at higher and secondary educational establishments out of the total Jewish population of the USSR is 3.15. These are specific figures. No other nationality has such a high percentage of its members at higher and secondary educational establishments in the Soviet Union.

207. Tekoah is attempting to mislead the General Assembly in his statements. Shame on him!

6 Quoted in English by the speaker.

208. I have a second letter, from a group of Jewish women living at Kiev. They write:

“We, the Jews of the Soviet Union, do not know the leaders of Israel and we do not wish to know them, for such as they are not people in our eyes. They have no homeland and they will never understand the full meaning of that word. We should like to remind them of those who buried Jews alive at Babi Yar, and who killed and burned children and old people. How quickly they have forgotten the torments that were suffered from 1941 to 1945! And today, when the blood is not yet dry that was shed by our husbands and fathers on the fronts during the Great Patriotic War and by innocent victims in the then occupied territory, they want to condemn Jews to further torments, to force them to make further sacrifices. The Meirs and Dayans have sold themselves to those who ruined our happiness then and destroyed mankind 25 years ago.

“They have miscalculated. The kind of Jew on whom they are counting does not exist in the Soviet Union. We Jewish women, whose husbands perished in the struggle against fascism, were left with small children. The homeland helped us to raise and educate them.

“Do not poke your noses into others’ affairs, Zionists!”

Such was the reply of Soviet Jews to the Israeli Zionists.

209. As I have already said, only the day before yesterday a large group of Soviet tourists arrived in New York, including scientists, generals and physicians. Among them is the world-famous General Dragunsky. He appeared on New York television yesterday in uniform. He exposed Zionism, its crimes and misdeeds. That was the voice of a Soviet Jew, a true voice, and not that of a Zionist agent such as Tekoah and his Zionist leaders look to.

210. Tekoah quoted the distinguished contemporary Soviet poet, Yevtushenko; but he distorted the substance of his poetry. Yevtushenko, an outstanding poet of the contemporary era, mourns the sufferings of the Jews during the Great Patriotic War, together with the sufferings of all Soviet peoples. But he does not mourn Zionism. He is merciless in his condemnation of Zionism, as is every other Soviet citizen, irrespective of his nationality.

211. Mr. Tekoah cried out pathetically that our country’s memorials to the victims of the Fascist occupation do not mention particularly that the victims were of Jewish nationality. But that is a monstrous demand, an insult to the national feeling of all Soviet people, and to all Soviet victims who died.

212. The Ukrainian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Shevel, quoted a figure: 130,000 Soviet citizens who were tortured and buried at Babi Yar. They included 70,000 Jews, and the remaining 60,000 were of other nationalities—Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Azerbaijani, Kirghiz, Kazakh, and so on and so forth. Our country has 130 nationalities. Should we write an endless list: Jews, Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Azerbaijani, Armenians, Kirghiz, Kazakhs and so on? That would be an

absurdity, to say the least, and a slander. We raised those monuments to all the victims of fascism, to the heroes of the struggle for the freedom of our homeland, for the freedom of the whole world, for the liberation of Africa and Asia and for the peace which enabled the Israeli State to be born and to exist.

213. Mr. Tekoah referred to previous statements in the United Nations by my friend, colleague and predecessor, the present Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, and to my previous statements.

214. Yes, we spoke in favour of the existence of Israel and we do not go back on that now. However, at present Israel is an aggressor; it is ignoring the United Nations, and is ignoring the basic principle reaffirmed at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], and in many other documents—the principle of the inadmissibility of the seizure of other nations’ territory by force.

215. This is the fact of the matter. Now that Israel has become the aggressor, we oppose its policy, together with the rest of the Members of the United Nations.

216. Mr. Tekoah was silent about the fact that the Security Council has dozens of times condemned Israel as an aggressor. Ambassador Tomeh has reminded us of this. Israel was condemned for its aggression in a resolution of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly. So what is it that you want, Mr. Tekoah? Do you want us to praise you for that? Do not hope for praise.

217. We are resolutely campaigning against aggression in any form, against any form of international tyranny. We always speak up in defence of the victims of aggression. That is why we are so sympathetic with and understanding of the interests of the Arab countries, which have suffered from Israeli violence and aggression, from international piracy. So do not expect that we shall be the friends of an aggressor: the Soviet Union has never been and will never be the friend of aggressors.

218. Mr. Tekoah made a slanderous reference to 1939 and our non-aggression pact with Germany. He knows well, although he hides it, that this pact helped to prevent Hitler from unleashing the Second World War at that time, when the Western Powers did not want to conclude an alliance with us and join forces against Hitler. We remained alone then. We had to gain time, to reorganize our army, to prepare new arms and to strengthen our defences. Through the non-aggression pact we gained about two years, delaying Hitler’s aggression against our homeland. That made it possible for us to destroy Hitler’s war machine, which had mobilized all of Europe against us, to save ourselves—and to save you too, Mr. Tekoah. If we had not won at Stalingrad, at Kursk and in all the other famous historic battles between the Soviet armed forces and Hitler’s army, you would not exist and you would not be able to come up to this rostrum and slander us.

219. As a former Israeli Ambassador to the Soviet Union, you ought to be able to understand this, if you were not blinded by Zionist hatred for the Soviet Union.

220. A typical Fascist feature can be seen in the acts of banditry against Soviet institutions and organizations now being committed in the United States, with the connivance of the United States authorities, by such as the so-called Jewish Defense League. Both the Zionist leaders in Israel and Mr. Tekoah personally, who from this rostrum proclaimed the same slogans as are proclaimed by the band of brigands which calls itself the Jewish Defense League, are directly connected with these base attacks and terrorist acts by Zionists.

221. The statements by the Israeli representative here are a diversionary tactic. He has not said a word in condemnation of the terror provoked by United States Zionist extremists. He has not disavowed them. He has not condemned the extremists from the Fascist-like League, who resort to Fascist methods of violence, terror and calumny. In his statement he gave inspiration and moral support to these bandits and terrorists. Such is the representative of Israel, who spoke here from the rostrum of the General Assembly. He has indulged in demagoguery about respect for the rights of mankind and of peoples, but he did not find a single word to condemn the bandits and terrorists who resort to unprecedented international crimes and fire on a foreign diplomatic mission accredited to the United Nations. He was silent on that. That sums up his entire Zionist attitude.

222. The leader of this fascistic band of Zionists, Rabbi Kahane, recently returned from Israel. When he arrived in New York, as I have already said, he immediately appeared on television and directly threatened to commit terrorist acts against Soviet diplomats.

223. The Israeli representative knows about that, both from the newspapers and from statements made here, but he has failed to condemn criminal statements of this kind by Kahane. We are entitled to ask the Israeli representative and the Israeli Government: who inspired such villainous declarations and such criminal plans on the part of the Zionist extremist, Kahane, who had just returned from Israel? Who put this criminal thought into his head? From whom did he receive instructions to carry out such criminal acts, to perpetrate terrorist acts against Soviet diplomats in New York?

224. It is not difficult to see that he brought back the whole criminal package from Israel. The conclusion is clear: the Israel Zionist leaders and their Zionist friends and protectors here in this country bear direct responsibility for the violence and terrorist acts perpetrated by Israel's "fifth column" in the United States, by Zionist SS men from the "Jewish Defense League". They cannot be called anything else—they are Zionist SS men in the United States. This is a fifth column, created in the United States by Israeli Zionists on the pattern of Hitler's columns.

225. This is a political description of that band and its acts. While Kahane was on United States television threatening to perpetrate acts of terrorism against Soviet diplomats, his henchmen from the "Jewish Defense League", which he leads, were carrying out an act of terrorism against the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations. They fired upon the Mission building, putting four children in mortal danger. Who will deny that this is a

monstrous crime which deserves the most severe punishment in any civilized country? The Israeli representative, speaking from this rostrum, talks a great deal about the defence of human rights, but has said nothing about this monstrous crime committed by his henchmen and friends from the Fascist band of Zionists calling itself the "Jewish Defense League". He repeats here their stupid and absurd slogan; "my people".

226. It is now well known to everybody that one of the bandits who was directly involved in the firing on our Mission building is a member of this criminal organization. This has been widely reported by the New York radio, by television and by the press, and we even know the name of the criminal, who is the son of a rabbi—Isaac Jaroslowitz, a student. Kahane is himself a rabbi, and is the leader of the Fascist Zionist band which took up arms and turned to violence and terror against foreign diplomats, against the United Nations. A rabbi's son fires on the Soviet Mission. What does this mean? Are United States rabbis the fifth column of Israeli Zionists in the United States? Rabbis are "men of God", and it would seem that their professional calling is to instil the highest ideals into believers. That at least is how we atheists understand religious dogma and the sacred obligation of ministers of religion. But Rabbi Kahane incites people to murder, to terror, to violence, and the son of a United States rabbi, Isaac Jaroslowitz, commits a terrorist act against the Soviet Mission. How do you explain that, Mr. Defender-of-Human-Rights Tekoah? This is all the result of your slanderous campaign and the work of your Zionist leaders against the Soviet Union. Zionism's pathological hatred of the Soviet Union nurtures anti-Sovietism and those criminal acts which are being perpetrated in the United States against Soviet diplomats and Soviet citizens.

227. Let us hope that the representative of the United States, Mr. Bush, will now change the position he took up yesterday, when he could not bring himself to accuse the Fascist Zionist extremists of having perpetrated this criminally punishable terrorist act against the USSR Mission to the United Nations.

228. At the very time of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly, where Zionism and its criminal acts were being exposed and condemned, brutalized hooligans from this Fascist group of Zionists were continuing their villainy.

229. On 21 October they broke a glass door in the building of the USSR Mission to the United Nations. And here at the main entrance to United Nations Headquarters, in the area of the General Assembly hall, they tried to tear down the flag of the Soviet Union. We are grateful to United Nations security staff for preventing that crime.

230. In the United States and throughout the world there is much talk and even legends about the Mafia of Italian extraction in the United States. However, for some reason little is heard about another mafia which has penetrated every aspect of life from the top to the bottom of this country—the mafia of Zionist extraction. It is the Zionist mafia in the United States which is the number one enemy of the United Nations. Why is this? The answer is very simple and clear.

231. The United Nations and the overwhelming majority of its Members have condemned and do condemn categori-

cally, severely, repeatedly and unconditionally the aggression of the Israeli Zionists against the Arab States.

232. The United Nations and the overwhelming majority of its Members resolutely and unconditionally demand immediate and unswerving implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) on a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East.

233. This is the fourth year that Israel has been sabotaging the implementation of that resolution. Zionists in the United States and throughout the world are infuriated by this just position of the United Nations and the overwhelming majority of its Members. They will stop at no crime, including the use of violence and terror against the United Nations and those Missions to the United Nations whose Governments have most firmly and consistently upheld the just position of the United Nations on the question of a Middle East settlement by peaceful political means. It is for that reason that the Zionist mafia in the United States has embarked on the road of violence and terror towards both the United Nations as a whole and Missions to the United Nations.

234. It is no secret that many highly placed United Nations officials receive threatening letters if they do not play the Zionists' game and have their own opinions on the aggressive policy of the Zionists and their racist Fascist philosophy and ideology.

235. Who is guilty and who is answerable for all these misdeeds committed by Zionist extremists in the United States and other Western countries? Both today and yesterday many representatives mentioned such misdeeds from this rostrum. The main culprits are the Israeli Zionist leaders and their Zionist friends and protectors in the United States, who have raised anti-sovietism, anti-communism and anti-arabism to the rank of a national policy. In order to distract attention from their criminal aggression in the Middle East against the Arab States and from four years of deliberate sabotaging and frustration of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) on a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, they have invented a non-existent problem, and have fabricated anti-Soviet slander about the so-called position of Jews in the Soviet Union. With this legend, this invention, this slander they are trying to delude the entire world and above all the people of the United States.

236. Mr. Tekoah referred to a statement by the head of the Soviet Government, Mr. Kosygin, which was made at a meeting with members of the Canadian Parliament. However, he passed over in silence the fact that Mr. Kosygin, in his address to the Canadian parliamentarians, firmly and clearly stated that there is no Jewish problem whatsoever in the Soviet Union. That is a fact, it is the truth. But the Zionists are trying to refute the truth by means of slander and insinuation against the Soviet Union. And all you gentlemen here witnessed yesterday and today similar acts by the Zionists in the form of statements made by the Israeli representative from this rostrum.

237. Who gave Israel the right to claim that it is the representative and defender of Jews in all countries of the world? Who gave the Israeli Zionists the right to declare

themselves the defenders of Soviet, French, English, American, Italian, Belgian, Kenyan and all other Jews in any other country of the world? Israel regards every Jew as its citizen. On what basis does Israel arrogate to itself this right? Who gave Israel the right to consider every Jew in every country as its own, Israeli, citizen? On what basis does the Israeli representative to the United Nations, speaking from this rostrum, call Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality his brothers? We—Soviet citizens of Russian, Ukrainian, Georgian, Armenian and many other nationalities of the USSR—are the real brothers of Soviet Jewish citizens, and not you, Mr. Tekoah, and your Zionist leaders. You, as the Israeli representative, and your Zionist leaders propagate Fascist racist ideology with its absurd legend of a chosen people. Racist ideology in any form is hateful to all Soviet citizens, including citizens of Jewish nationality. For that reason you cannot be brothers of Soviet Jews, any more than the Fascist could. For that reason you are their enemies, and not their friends. No amount of pathetic speeches from this rostrum can conceal that fact.

238. Your claims that you are brothers and friends of Soviet Jews and that you are entitled to interfere in their affairs cannot be regarded as anything other than expansionism and as gross and barefaced interference in the domestic affairs of other States.

239. Having started on that road, Israel is flagrantly violating the United Nations Charter, which forbids anyone, including Zionists, to interfere in the internal affairs of States.

240. Mr. Tekoah, the Israeli representative, has no right to proclaim from this rostrum the slogan "My people" when speaking of Soviet, French, English and American Jews. Proclaim that slogan for the Jews who live in Israel—they are your people. But do not interfere in the affairs of other countries and do not claim that Soviet Jews are your people.

241. Why do the Israeli Zionists press for the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel? The question of emigration of citizens of the USSR from our country is our internal affair. In accordance with Soviet legislation, the Soviet State examines individually each separate application involving the travel abroad of Soviet citizens. The Zionists have absolutely no right to interfere in such domestic matters.

242. We well understand why the Zionists press so importunately for Israel to receive Soviet Jews. There was a recent report about this in the pages of what I would describe as the organ of the Zionists in the United States and elsewhere—*The New York Times*. A correspondent of the paper reported from Tel Aviv that Russian Jews arriving in Israel were highly educated people and highly qualified specialists, quite different from Jewish immigrants coming to Israel from other countries. They are proud, with individuality and great humane qualities. Who raised them? The Soviet homeland. Who gave them higher education? The Soviet homeland. At whose expense? At the expense of the working people of the Soviet Union. At the expense of Soviet workers and peasants they studied, received higher education and became highly qualified specialists. In your Zionist blindness, you forget this and pass over it in

silence. The article speaks of the disastrous situation of Soviet Jews who have emigrated to Israel.

243. Why does Israel need highly educated and highly qualified Jews? The answer to that question is also clear and simple. Israel needs such qualified people mainly in order to increase its military potential with a view to continuing the aggression against the Arab states.

244. I can assure the Israeli representative and his Zionist leaders that the Soviet Union, the Soviet authorities and the Soviet Jews will not go along with that. And while Israel continues its policy of aggression and expansion, there can be no question of sending to Israel our highly educated and highly qualified military specialists, scientists and medical workers. Remember that, Mr. Israeli Representative.

245. We warn Israel and its Zionist leaders: do not interfere in our internal affairs, and give up your stupid and absurd claim that USSR citizens of Jewish nationality are citizens of Israel, and not Soviet citizens. Do not, like Hitler, set up fifth columns in other countries—or else the Zionists will have to pay for it.

246. Such claims by Israel and its Zionist leaders will make Israel and its leaders a laughing-stock to be condemned throughout the world.

247. As Soviet representative to the United Nations, I should like once again to repeat what I said at the 1582nd meeting of the Security Council during the discussion of Israeli crimes in Jerusalem: do not poke your long noses into our Soviet affairs. History teaches that anyone who pokes his long nose into our affairs will find himself without a nose. Put that in your pipes, Zionists, and smoke it.

248. I should like to say a few words in response to the reply of the United Kingdom representative [1973rd meeting] to my remarks about the chain of provocative acts hostile to the Soviet Union initiated in his country. I too shall attempt to be brief. His reference to defending United Kingdom security by means of anti-Soviet provocation does not stand up to criticism and has no foundation. It is not only unfounded but was fabricated for purposes clearly hostile to the Soviet Union. That provocation cannot be regarded in isolation from the general line of United Kingdom policy, which systematically raises obstacles to the reduction of international tension, particularly in European affairs, contrary to the desire of many European countries for normalization and the holding of a conference on European security. Such provocative methods have repeatedly been used by United Kingdom leaders, particularly by the Conservatives. This is one of the favourite methods of anti-sovietism. In the long chain of such provocations it is sufficient to recall that the main instigator of the intervention in Russia after the 1917 October Revolution was the United Kingdom and its War Minister, the late Winston Churchill. That is a historical fact.

249. I must also recall the hostile "Curzon ultimatum" and the false Comintern letter known by historians as the "Zinoviev letter", which is recognized by leading English and American historians to be a forgery. One could also

mention the provocative attack on the All Russian Cooperative Society Limited, and many others. In my previous statement I also recalled the provocative speech by the late Winston Churchill at Fulton in the United States, which ushered in the sombre cold war epoch. History thus shows that it is not a question of a threat to the security of the United Kingdom. I might remind representatives that only a few days ago none other than the United Kingdom Foreign Minister, Sir Alec Douglas-Home made an obviously inflammatory statement on the subject of relations between the Soviet Union and China. Why did he have to do that? In the light of the historical facts, the reason is perfectly obvious. It is obvious that the issue is not the security of the United Kingdom. The real issue is fear among United Kingdom ruling circles of the easing of tension, particularly on the European continent. That is what the Tories fear; having been Soviet Ambassador to the United Kingdom for seven years I have carefully studied the history of the United Kingdom and Tory policies. That is the main reason for the latest provocations against the Soviet Union.

250. In conclusion, I should like to give you, as material evidence of the criminal terrorist act committed against the USSR Mission to the United Nations, five photographs showing the bullet holes in the window of the apartment of the Counsellor to the Mission. I request that these important documents be added to the official documents of the General Assembly.

251. The PRESIDENT: There are still three representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply: the representatives of Syria, the United States of America and Israel. Two of them have already repeatedly exercised the right of reply in connexion with the present matter. It is now almost 7.30 p.m. I believe, therefore, that the time has come to enforce the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 1937th plenary meeting on 24 September 1971, namely, that interventions in exercise of the right of reply shall be limited to 10 minutes.

252. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, although I would have liked very much to see limitations placed earlier on the exercise by speakers of their right of reply, I am, at any rate, very much aware of the late hour and shall try to abide by your ruling.

253. It is not a mere coincidence that we have been discussing the Middle East question alongside the agenda item which is now under consideration, namely, the question of China. I shall limit myself to two basic points raised by the representative of Israel: the concept of right and Zionism's philosophy of right. For the Israeli representative, Mr. Tekoah, started by asking, "Why should we"—namely, the Israelis and the Zionists—"be denied the right to regain our freedom in the land of our ancestors where we lived 2,000 years ago?"

254. Put in that way, the question is a fallacious one, for rights are not discussed in abstract; rights are discussed in concrete terms. What is the right claimed? To whom should it be granted? When should it be granted? Under what conditions? Does this right infringe any other?

255. The whole tragedy with which we are dealing is that the Israeli and Zionist concept of right is predicated,

vis-à-vis the Arabs, upon the following: first, the violation of Arab rights and utter negation of their legality and inviolability; secondly, the use of every means, including terror and warfare, to achieve Zionist aims in Eretz Israel—defined in the Israeli Jewish book as extending from the Nile to the Euphrates; thirdly, the use of a higher law which sets the Zionists apart from mankind for justification of their deeds—witness the following saying by Mador, one of the leaders of the Haganah: “We were conspirators outside the law but obeying what, to us, was a higher law”—and, fourthly, the conviction that Zionists are ordained to redeem the “Jewish Homeland” and rid Palestine completely of the Arabs.

256. An Indonesian in Indonesia has the absolute right to be in Indonesia; an American Jew in New York has the absolute right to be in New York; a Frenchman in France has the absolute right to be in France. But when a Frenchman, an American, or “X”, or “Y” or “Z” comes to an Arab land, already populated, owned and inhabited for thousands of years by its original inhabitants, that is infringement on a right, that is a negation of a right: that is no more a right; that is an injustice.

257. And when we Arabs, in all our cities, have looked around for 25 years and see 2 million refugees who have been deprived of their right to their homeland, their birthright, we cannot but remember that the rights claimed by the Zionists are not rights, but wrongs. The basic conflict is not a conflict of a right with a right; the basic conflict is the conflict of a right with a wrong. Every statesman has the right to think of the happiness of his people, but does the desire of a statesman to build the happiness of his people justify inflicting suffering on others?

258. Despite the fact that you have granted me only 10 minutes, Mr. President, I should like to read a few paragraphs from one of the masterpieces of literature, Dostoyevsky's novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*.

259. A conversation is taking place between Ivan and Alyosha. He says to him:

“‘One can hardly live in rebellion, and I want to live. Tell me yourself’”—and I say this to Mr. Tekoah—“‘I challenge you—answer. Imagine that you are creating a fabric of human destiny with the object of making men happy in the end, giving them peace and rest at last, but that it was essential and inevitable to torture to death only one tiny creature—that baby beating its breast with its fist, for instance—and to found that edifice on its unavenged tears, would you consent to be the architect on those conditions? Tell me, and tell the truth.’”

“‘No, I wouldn't consent,’ said Alyosha softly.

“‘And can you admit the idea that men for whom you are building it would agree to accept their happiness on the foundation of the unexpiated blood of a little victim? And accepting it would remain happy for ever?’”

“‘No, I can't admit it . . .’”.\*

\* Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, Constance Garnett translation (New York, Modern Library, n.d.), pp. 254-255.

260. Our answer to the question of Mr. Tekoah about the rights after our sufferings and the negation of our rights is, “No, we cannot admit it.”

261. To refresh the memory of Mr. Tekoah—although after hearing him speak in Arabic I really doubt whether he can speak Hebrew, because the words which he uttered in Arabic have the same letters in Hebrew and cannot be pronounced as he pronounced them—I would refer him to *Sefer Hapalmah*,<sup>7</sup> which is a book written in Hebrew and consists of two volumes. In volume 2 of that book there are maps drawn by the Palmach and the Haganah showing all the areas that Israeli Jewish terrorist underground organizations would occupy after the partition. On page 98 of volume 2, there is a map dated 1941 for the military occupation by the Israelis of Damascus.

262. Continuing on the subject of rights, I wish to remind Mr. Tekoah of the following words of one of the professors of the Hebrew University, addressing Yisrael Galili:

“Don't forget . . . that the Jewish national home and the establishment of the State of Israel were the result of an agreement between the great Powers imposed upon the Arabs. When, therefore, you state that you do not recognize the Arabs of Palestine as a moral or legal entity in Palestine with specific national characteristics, you are in fact saying that they are ‘natives’, with no identity of their own.”

Mr. Tekoah, we refuse that.

263. The United Nations has recognized in two resolutions, of 1969 and 1970 [*resolutions 2535 B (XXIV) and 2672 C (XXV)*], that the problem of Palestine has arisen from the denial of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine and consequently it has twice reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. Until those rights are implemented there will be no peace—and I shall not mince words.

264. Connected with this phony concept of rights is the refusal of the Israeli speaker to recognize Israel's connexion with Nazi Germany and its basic Nazi philosophy. Yesterday I quoted from *Perfidy*. I wish everybody would read that book. But who doubts the greatness of the Israeli philosopher, Martin Buber? This is what he said in a speech in New York on 1 June 1958:

“When we returned to Palestine, the decisive question was: Do we want to come there as an ally, as a friend, as a brother, as a member of the coming community of the peoples of the Near East, or as the representatives of colonialism and imperialism?”

He goes on to say:

“It was Hitler who brought Jewish masses to Palestine, not selected people who felt that hence they must fulfill their lives and prepare the future. So, selective organic development was replaced by mass immigration and the indispensable necessity to find political force for its

<sup>7</sup> Zeiubabel Gilad, ed. (Tel Aviv, Hakibutz Hameuchad Ltd., 1954).

security . . . The majority of the Jewish people preferred to learn from Hitler . . .”.

Those are the words of Martin Buber.

265. Connected with the concept of rights is how rights are applied in Israel to the Israeli orientals and to the Arabs who are still living in Israel? An Indian scholar of the Jewish faith who migrated to Israel and is now in New York University published a book in which he says:

“Every attempt, then, is made to hammer home to the entire population that it is ‘we,’ the Europeans, who constitute the norm in Israel. ‘Israel belongs to Europe—culturally, politically and economically—despite her being situated in the Middle East geographically,’ a leading member of the Israeli government said recently when explaining Israel’s application for membership in the European Common Market.”<sup>8</sup>

I say to Mr. Tekoah, “It is in the Middle East, but it is not of the Middle East as long as that is its philosophy.”

266. Another authority, an American of Jewish faith, I. F. Stone, a former Haganah sympathizer, wrote this in 1969:

“The usual Jewish attitude toward the Arabs is one of contemptuous superiority. Our driver Northward was a Jew who had fled from the Nazi advance into Hungary, but that did not save him from racist habits. When I suggested that we give a boy a lift, he refused, saying the boy was an Arab. When I asked what was the difference, he said Arabs smelled bad.”

He goes on to say:

“ . . . And there, as in America, the problem of poverty is intensified by colour and ‘race’. Israel has a double ‘Negro’ problem. The darker Jews from the Orient and North Africa, as well as the Arab minority, suffer from prejudice.”

And who has not heard about the revolt of the oriental Jews in Israel? Who did not hear last week that black American Jews had been turned out of Israel because of their colour? I say to Mr. Tekoah, we refuse to be an inferior race in our own country.

267. With regard to what he said about Syria and the teaching of hatred, and so on, what I have just read is enough to show what is the spirit of Israeli philosophy and education. Indeed, the representative of the Soviet Union has dwelt at length on that point and spared me the need to develop it further. But Mr. Tekoah keeps on and on reminding us of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

268. Who is deceiving whom?

269. If Israel wants peace, why did not Israel accept peace when the Arab States signed the Lausanne Protocol of 12 May 1949, accepting the partition resolution and plan as

the basis of a solution for the refugees, for secure and agreed boundaries, and for the problem of Jerusalem? Israel was not then a Member of the United Nations. When it was accepted, Israel rejected the Lausanne Protocol, saying, “We cannot in 1949 accept an arbitrary partition of Palestine that was decided in 1947”. Now, from 1967 to 1970, they have been saying, “We cannot accept an arbitrary partition, except for what we have gained by war”. Did not Dayan say more than once. “The end is not yet in sight”?

270. In this connexion, I wish to bring to the attention of representatives here what the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization says:

“The Security Council’s cease-fire resolutions”—mind you, “resolutions”, in the plural—“of June 1967 and its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, if implemented simultaneously and fully, should provide the framework for achieving a peaceful and agreed settlement of the present conflict.” [A/8401/Add.1, para. 222.]

We have always maintained, and we still maintain, that Israel must accept the cease-fire resolutions. And mind you, there were four cease-fire resolutions, not just one: resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967, 234 (1967) of 7 June, 235 (1967) of 9 June and 236 (1967) of 11 June. And why did Israel not accept them? Because Israel would not stop its conquest until it reached the frontiers where it now stands and imposed peace on the Arabs. The Arabs will not accept an imposed peace.

271. Finally, let me—since Mr. Tekoah spoke for over one hour—quote with the following from Bertrand Russell, on the tragedy of the Middle East. He said on 14 February 1970, according to *The Times* of London:

“The latest phase of the undeclared war in the Middle East is based upon a profound miscalculation. The bombing raids deep into Egyptian territory will not persuade the civilian population to surrender, but will stiffen their resolve to resist. This is the lesson of all aerial bombardment. The Vietnamese, who have endured years of American heavy bombing have responded not by capitulation but by shooting down more enemy aircraft. In 1940 my own fellowcountrymen resisted Hitler’s bombing raids with unprecedented unity and determination. For this reason, the present Israeli attacks will fail in their essential purpose, but at the same time they must be condemned vigorously throughout the world.

“The development of the crisis in the Middle East is both dangerous and instructive. For over 20 years Israel has expanded by force of arms. After every stage in this expansion Israel has appealed to ‘reason’ and has suggested ‘negotiations’. This is the traditional role of the imperial power, because it wishes to consolidate with the least difficulty what it has taken already by violence. Every new conquest becomes the new basis of the proposed negotiation from strength, which ignores the injustice of the previous aggression. The aggression committed by Israel must be condemned, not only because no State has the right to annex foreign territory, but because every expansion is also an experiment to

<sup>8</sup> Michael Selzer, *The Aryanization of the Jewish State* (New York, Black Star Publishing Company, 1967), p. 70.

discover how much more aggression the world will tolerate.”

He went on to say:

“The refugees who surround Palestine in their hundreds of thousands were described recently by the Washington journalist I. F. Stone as ‘the moral millstone around the neck of world Jewry’. Many of the refugees are now well into the third decade of their precarious existence in temporary settlements. The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was ‘given’ by a foreign Power to another people for the creation of a new State. The result was that many hundreds of thousands of innocent people were made permanently homeless. With every new conflict their numbers have increased. How much longer is the world willing to endure this spectacle of wanton cruelty? It is abundantly clear that the refugees have every right to the homeland from which they were driven, and the denial of this right is at the heart of the continuing conflict.”

272. This, in a nutshell, is what I said: that a right is a just right only so long as it does not negate another right. But as we heard from Bertrand Russell—not from a Syrian or Arab spokesman—the Israeli right and the Zionist right have led to the negation of the rights of hundreds of thousands, of millions of Arabs. These are not rights; they are travesties of rights, they are aggressions. Whatever Mr. Tekoah said or is going to say will be nothing but the pronouncement of a guilty conscience.

273. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): My reply will be very brief. First, let me assure the representative of the Soviet Union that I have not lessened and I will not lessen my energies in condemning the Jewish Defense League or any other extremist group that threatens, harasses, abuses or bullies. That question was raised, and appropriately so, and I reaffirm to the representatives assembled here the point I made yesterday [1972nd meeting], namely, that we reject out of hand this kind of tactic. I repeat it now.

274. But let me be very clear: I must take exception to one particular part of the speech that we heard from Ambassador Malik. I cannot remain silent while the Ambassador condemns all Jewish leaders in my country. The responsible leaders in our country condemn the JDL—the Jewish Defense League—just as much as I do, just as much as everyone here assembled does. They feel the same outrage at these cowardly attacks on children that I do, the same outrage that Ambassador Malik feels and that Ambassador Tomeh feels, that every ambassador, in fact, in this room feels. In our agony over the actions of the extremists we must not permit, and I, as a representative of the United States, cannot permit, a condemnation of so many fine American citizens who are Jewish by faith. We should not let these halls ring with these broad-brush attempts at prejudice.

275. Though I was not in this chamber when another subject was being discussed, I understand that it was suggested from this rostrum, by another delegation, that the United States authorities connive with organizations which practise violence—connive with the Jewish Defense League. This is a contemptible charge. It is without

foundation. It is a bare-faced, unvarnished lie, and I do not like to hear it levelled against the United States of America.

276. I think we can all be grateful for the prompt police work that resulted so quickly in an arrest, and I hope it will be followed by a conviction.

277. I will not here further inject myself into what, regrettably, seems to have become a violent dispute, but I must totally reject the charges that all American Jews support the concept of violence and terror that a tiny lunatic fringe practises. Our citizens do not support these hateful tactics, and while that tiny lunatic fringe practises them, millions of their brethren, millions of good Americans, deplore those tactics.

278. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): To the invective, abuse, personal slander, which we heard from the representative of Syria I shall reply with one sentence, a sentence taken out of the Talmud: “Taunt not thy neighbour with thy own blemish.”

279. I shall not stoop either to the exchange of personal abuse to which we were subjected here this evening by the representative of the Soviet Union. I should like, however, to say that this Assembly deserves better than to be subjected to the kind of statements, filled with distortions of fact, with lies, with personal invective, as delivered by Mr. Malik. He went even so far as to distort my own statement of yesterday and the attitude of my Government toward the Jewish Defense League. All he had to do, all he should have done, was to open and look at the verbatim record of yesterday’s meeting. He chose not to do it simply in order to be able so much more easily to heap abuse and slander and distortions of fact on this Assembly.

280. If members of this august body wonder what it means to be a Jew in the Soviet Union today, picture the helpless, defenceless Jews listening to the kind of words, witnessing the kind of gestures, being exposed to the kind of spirit reflected in Mr. Malik’s statement today.

281. On 25 September, at its 1582nd meeting, the representative of the Soviet Union heaped on the Security Council a diatribe of anti-Jewish attacks, of abuse against the Jewish religion. He went so far as to speak of my long Jewish nose. We remember those expressions; all of us do. He repeated them today.

282. Hundreds of telegrams were received in my Mission expressing indignation at this kind of attack. I understand that hundreds of telegrams were addressed to the President of the General Assembly, to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, protesting the behaviour in that organ of the family of nations—behaviour which should not be allowed in the lowest and the most insignificant of organizations, not to speak of the United Nations. And it is no secret that representatives from many nations—and not only those distant from the Soviet Union, but even those close to the Soviet Union—expressed their reservations, their distress, their criticism at this behaviour of the representative of the Soviet Union.

283. Yet, yesterday and again today, the United Nations and the world were subjected once more to this kind of

attack. Under the guise of rejecting the Jewish people's national movement of liberation, zionism, under the guise of slurring this movement of national liberation, the representative of the Soviet Union delivered himself again of an attack on some of the highest and most sacred values of the Jewish civilization, of the Jewish faith, of the Jewish people.

284. I spent three years in the Soviet Union, in the midst of the Soviet people. I came to admire the achievements of that great Power. I became attached to the beauty of that lovely land. But this is precisely why, throughout those three years and ever since then, my heart has bled—as I am sure the heart of any man of goodwill would—that of all the 107 nationalities which make up the Soviet Union, the Jews are not allowed to enjoy equally with others the achievements, the beauty, the human rights of the Soviet Union. Mr. Malik tried to suggest today that there is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union. His Prime Minister, the day before yesterday at a meeting in Ottawa, said, with regard to the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union: "Such problems exist around the world—the Negroes in the United States, the Irish in Britain." We agree. We do not want your Dragunskys, Mr. Malik. Every nation, every people has its Dragunskys. But our Kochubiyevskys who are still in prison, are still begging to be allowed to live as Jews: do let them go.

285. Finally, the representative of the Soviet Union spoke again of aggression. He referred to resolutions of the United Nations. We do not have as short a memory as apparently the representative of the Soviet Union has this evening. We do remember that his Government, we do remember that his delegation tried again and again to get through the General Assembly and through the Security Council draft resolutions that would define Israel's repulse of the Arab onslaught, Israel's reaction to the acts of war, the blockade, the massing of huge armies, the declarations that the time for the final battle had come to destroy a Member State and annihilate its people—to define all this as Israeli aggression. The General Assembly and the Security Council voted these attempts down. There is not a single document in this house which refers to Israeli aggression.

286. And may I say to Mr. Malik once again that history cannot be rewritten by political statements or by political resolutions. Hitler and Hitler's army were the aggressors against the Soviet Union, from the beginning of their attack against that country, and remained aggressors even after Stalingrad, when the Soviet armies pushed the invader back and occupied large chunks of German territory. Israel was not the aggressor but the victim of aggression in 1948 when the Arab armies invaded it—a time when the Soviet Union spoke out openly in the United Nations and condemned Arab aggression—and Israel remains the target of Arab aggression, even after it has succeeded in repelling the Arab armies, even after it succeeded in pushing them back, even at the time when it stands as it does on cease-fire lines, in accordance with the cease-fire resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

287. I shall end on a note of hope, because I do not feel that the words we heard today really reflect the feelings of the Soviet peoples or, for that matter, of the Soviet leaders. I shall end on a note of hope because I am certain that the

time will come when the Soviet people and the Soviet Government will look with shame and regret upon what we heard today from Ambassador Malik; the time will come when the Soviet Government will recognize the human rights of Soviet Jews and will permit Soviet Jews to vindicate those rights; the time will come when the Soviet Government will stop supporting belligerency in the Middle East and turn its efforts to peace; and then I am certain we shall hear words and statements entirely different from the ones pronounced today by the representative of the Soviet Union.

288. Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom): I apologize for speaking at this late hour. However, the representative of the Soviet Union has repeated his accusation that a recent action taken by my Government was aimed at preventing movement towards *détente* in Europe. I wish simply to repeat the denial made yesterday [1973rd meeting] by my Permanent Representative and to reserve my delegation's right to refer to this matter again at a later stage.

289. I might also note that the Soviet Prime Minister, when asked a question on this subject recently in Ottawa, said that he did not believe that the episode would affect the prospects for East-West *détente*.

290. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I take note of the assurances given by Ambassador Bush that the United States authorities will take all measures within their power effectively to oppose the crimes of the Zionist extremists, including the "Jewish Defense League".

291. I cannot in any way agree with Ambassador Bush that anyone in this hall intends to blame all American Jews for the crimes of the Zionist extremists. Nobody has said that; nobody believes it. I would ask Mr. Bush not to attribute such views to anyone here. We know how to make a distinction between the Fascist brigands of the "Jewish Defense League" and serious, worthy American Jews—outstanding scientists, writers, artists, poets, etc. I therefore beg you, Mr. Bush, not to follow in the steps of Mr. Tekoah, who is trying to replace anti-zionism with racist demagoguery about anti-Semitism.

292. We firmly protest against the crimes and terror inspired and patronized by the Zionist leaders of Israel and their representatives in the United States. But we have great respect for the Jewish population of the United States, since it includes many former compatriots of ours, worthy and respected people. We do not confuse them with Zionists. They are different people.

293. Mr. Bush claimed that the leaders of serious and responsible Zionist organizations condemn the extremists of the "Jewish Defense League". Unfortunately, their condemnation is only half-hearted. They say that they disagree only with the methods of the League, but that the actual idea behind the League is not a bad one. A very strange condemnation! Such condemnation should rather be called encouragement or patronage, even on the part of certain so-called "serious" leaders of "serious" Zionist organizations. Those are the facts which are obvious from observation of United States television or the United States press.

294. With regard to the "long nose" which the Israeli representative referred to pathetically, I can reassure him that my nose is no longer than his. When we speak of a "long nose", we have in mind enemies who poke their long noses into our internal affairs. There is an old Russian proverb: "Don't poke your long nose into my affairs"—in other words, I can look after myself without your interference and without your long nose. So do not find in that proverb, in that ancient popular saying, any racist meaning, because here again you are trying to turn everything into slander. We are not talking about the physical length of noses, but about politics, about Israel's aggression and the Zionists' hatred for the Soviet Union. We are talking about anti-sovietism and the attempts by Zionists to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and to conceal and justify Zionist Israeli aggression in the Middle East. I have said a great deal about this and do not intend to return to it now.

295. I was drawing a parallel between fascism and zionism. I referred to documents, to Israeli textbooks and to the concept of a "chosen people", which is absurd and criminal in the second half of the twentieth century. There are many similarities and much identity between the practice, theory and philosophy of fascism and zionism. There is also a similarity as regards external expansion. None other than Hitler's fascism claimed to represent all Germans in all countries of the world: in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Soviet Union—and even the United States, Mr. Bush. Hitler considered that German Americans were citizens of Hitlerite Germany. That was his fifth column. And, if my memory serves me right, at the beginning of the war the United States Government behaved correctly and put the Hitlerite fifth column in concentration camps or at least restricted its activities. Thus, the idea of claiming that Germans in all countries were German citizens belongs to Hitler; today it has been taken up by the Zionists. When the Israeli delegation proclaims in this important assembly the slogan "My people" with regard to Jews in the Soviet Union, France, the Arab countries, Africa, China (if there are Jews in China) or the United Kingdom, he is echoing Hitler's lesson and Hitler's practice. Why did the Hitlerites need that theory and that philosophy at the time? In order to conceal their policy of aggression, of seizing the territory of other countries and annihilating the peoples of other countries. Such are the facts of history. Fascism spoke of *lebensraum*. The quintessence of the Fascist philosophy was to use the theory of *lebensraum* as a cover for seizing foreign territories, evicting the peoples of other countries from those territories and annexing them. Are the Israeli Zionists not doing exactly the same in the Arab territories? They are. So here we see the same Hitlerite practice, and not only its philosophy, ideology and racist theory.

296. In this way, the Zionists themselves are establishing a sinister parallel between fascism and zionism: let them blame themselves and not dare to accuse others of anti-Semitism.

297. We deeply respect our fellow citizens of Jewish nationality, as I said in my previous statement. Mr. Tekoah quoted from Shakespeare, that English poet, writer and dramatist of great genius. He enjoys the greatest respect in our country: all his works have been translated into Russian. His plays are presented in dozens, possibly

hundreds, of theatres and clubs. We know very well one of Shakespeare's plays, *The Merchant of Venice*, in which Shakespeare's genius gave an annihilating criticism and condemnation of Shylock.

298. The Zionists, with their claims to world supremacy, to represent Jews in all countries, to seize foreign territories and evict foreign peoples, are the Shylocks of today. And who condemns the Shylocks of today? The most important international organization, the United Nations. The Israeli representative is wrong and is misleading the Assembly when he says that Israel has not been condemned. Surely the resolution adopted at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the Assembly was a condemnation of Israel for its policy of expansion and aggression against the Arab countries? What other condemnation is necessary? A Nuremberg trial? Things may come to that.

299. Mr. Tekoah expressed a note of hope. I also wish to do so. I should like to express the hope that the Israeli invaders will leave the Arab territories and finally comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and that a stable, lasting and just peace will be established in the Middle East. And let us hope that with time the Israeli leaders will acquire wisdom and behave in a manner befitting a Member of the United Nations, respecting and complying with the decisions of a principal organ of the United Nations, responsible for the strengthening and maintenance of international peace and security—the Security Council.

300. The PRESIDENT: I should like to adjourn this meeting, but there are still two representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply, those of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel. I shall allow them each two minutes. I call first on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

301. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): When Mr. Tekoah, tomorrow or Monday, reviews the text of what he said in his last reply, if he does not blush in shame, I must say he is a shameless man, because the juxtaposition of dirty adjectives that he used can only describe what I called the guilt complex which upsets him.

302. I have quoted Jewish authorities and books—Martin Buber, *Sefer Hapalmah*, and Professor Talmon of the Hebrew University. If he can try to prove that these men are liars, then either he does not understand Hebrew or he himself is a liar.

303. Second, I cannot pass over in silence the continuous deceit of the Zionist propaganda about the 1967 war. Now, Zionist propaganda led the world to believe that the Arabs wanted to attack Israel, and that therefore the Israelis defended themselves, under Article 51 of the Charter. Mr. Tekoah has just repeated that. But self-defence is conditional upon the existence of an attack. Did the Arabs attack? Can Mr. Tekoah, or anybody else in the world, say that the Arabs attacked?

304. Well, let me answer Mr. Tekoah by referring to no less a man than Rabin himself. This is from the *Jerusalem Post* of 29 February 1968:

"Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, . . . said in an interview published yesterday that he believed that President Nasser 'did not

want the war' of last June. He told *Le Monde* that Colonel Nasser apparently unwittingly unleashed the crisis by closing the Gulf of Aqaba. . .".

He went on to say that:

"I do not believe that Nasser wanted war. The two divisions he sent into Sinai on May 14 would not have been enough to unleash an offensive against Israel. He knew it and we knew it."

Apparently, the only man who still does not know it is Mr. Tekoah himself.

305. The question of nazism is better expressed in the words of the Nazi leader himself, Hitler. After every conquest in Europe he used to say, "This is not the last conquest." On 5 July 1967, this is what the Fuehrer of Israel, Dayan, said:

"Our fathers reached the frontiers that were recognized in the Partition Plan of 1947. Our generation reached the 1949 frontiers. But the six-day generation"—that is, the generation which unleashed the 5 June aggression—"were able to reach the Suez Canal, Jordan and the Golan Heights in Syria. This is not the end, for after the present cease-fire lines there will be new lines, but they will extend beyond the Jordan river, to Lebanon and to Central Syria as well."

I challenge Mr. Tekoah to deny that statement by Dayan.

306. Then, on 19 February 1970 another Fuehrer of Israel, General Weizmann, a grandson of Chaim Weizmann, said the following (I quote the *JTA Daily News Bulletin* of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency of 20 February 1970):

"There must be no territorial concessions whatever to the Arabs . . . Israel's Minister of Transport, declared at a United Jewish Appeal fund-raising dinner here last night"

—incidentally, for the benefit of Ambassador Bush, who, I see, has unfortunately left, the United Jewish Appeal is an American organization— . . . 'We must be suffering from some psychosis to think that we have to give back territory.' He maintained that 'Once the ancestral Israel is in our hands, any talks with the Arabs must be centred on Israel's rights with no territorial concessions.' General Weizmann, a nephew of the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first President, did not specify what he meant by 'ancestral Israel'."

That is what the Arabs today are faced with.

307. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the last speaker, the representative of Israel, for two minutes.

308. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The representative of Syria seems to have a certain weakness. Apparently he believes that one can solve international problems with misquotations and misrepresentations, and though a previous speaker suggested that there are many Jewish psychiatrists in this town I am not one of them and unfortunately I cannot help him to overcome this weakness.

309. The representative of the Soviet Union again replied in the usual spirit, and I rise to speak in regret at having heard the remarks he pronounced. He tried to correct a reference to long Jewish noses by referring to Shylock. If there is any need to try to understand the spirit of his words, it is enough to remember that reference to Shylock, and to recall what such references to Shylock have meant in the history of Jewish persecution, of anti-Semitism, of bloodshed against Jews.

310. He again tried to draw parallels with fascism. Perhaps there is a parallel, and it is as follows. The Nazis, the Fascists, called us Jews Communists. Today, the representative of a Communist State calls us Jews Nazis.

*The meeting rose at 8.20 p.m.*

