

UNITED NATIONS - AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE / NJJC

1985

THE JACOB BLAUSTEIN INSTITUTE
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

BLAUSTEIN
LIBRARY

SEP 4 1990

American Jewish
Committee

A Dismal Anniversary:

A Decade of the UN's
"Zionism Equals Racism" Resolution
1975-1985

By Sidney Liskofsky



The Jacob Blaustein Institute For The Advancement of Human Rights

Through a wide variety of programs, the Jacob Blaustein Institute aims to narrow the gap between the promise of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights agreements -- and the realization of these rights in practice.

Blaustein Institute projects fall roughly into four broad categories, albeit with considerable overlapping:

- a) scholarly endeavors designed to clarify basic human rights concepts or issues;
- b) educational and training programs to promote wider knowledge and use of international human rights principles and institutions, to develop a critical public constituency capable of extending and improving them, and to encourage young people to consider careers in this field;
- c) programs that nurture and strengthen human rights organizations and movements;
- d) the creation of a corpus of legal writings for use by human rights pleaders and advocates as they confront human rights violations.

In pursuing its objectives, the Blaustein Institute works with diverse academic institutions, foundations, national and international human rights organizations and legal groups.

A Dismal Anniversary:

A Decade of the UN's "Zionism Equals Racism" Resolution
1975-85

By Sidney Liskofsky*

Peoples with long histories have many anniversaries, some marking happy events, others sad ones. For Jews, the month of November is crowded with anniversaries, most concerned with the State of Israel: promise, creation, threat. On November 10, 1917, Great Britain, in the historic Balfour Declaration, announced its support for a Jewish national home in Palestine. On November 29, 1947, the UN General Assembly recommended the partition of Palestine, a British mandated territory, into separate Jewish and Arab states. In 1975, twenty-eight years and three wars after the partition vote, the Assembly adopted the infamous resolution 3379 declaring Zionism -- the founding ideology of the Jewish state -- to be a form of racism. Not coincidentally, in 1978 the Assembly proclaimed November 29, the anniversary of the partition recommendation, as International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. This people's representative, the Assembly had decreed, was the PLO, whose fundamental Covenant, in 1985 still unamended, would eliminate the Jewish state.

Why did resolution 3379 cause such outrage in the United States and elsewhere? After all, said some UN "realists," Assembly resolutions are merely non-binding recommendations, essentially rhetorical exercises. Others argued that African and many other delegates who voted for the resolution, knowing nothing about Zionism, really meant to protest against Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. Another response to the resolution was that there was indeed anti-Arab discrimination in Israel, and it didn't matter what it was called -- "racism" or "X."¹ Moreover, as we mark the resolution's tenth anniversary, the U.S., with the help of other Western governments, and even of some in the non-aligned camp, has succeeded twice in blocking moves again to condemn Zionism, in Geneva in August 1983 at the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and in July 1975 at The Nairobi World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women. Why does Zionism equals racism matter?

The reasons for initial outrage at Zionism equals racism are still potent today. UN Ambassador (now Senator) D. Patrick Moynihan, in at-

*Sidney Liskofsky directs The Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights of the American Jewish Committee.

tributing the Zionism-equals-racism resolution to "the world's most powerful propaganda apparatus, that of the Soviet Union and the dozens of governments which echo it," has summed up its real significance thus: "it is not just a slogan, it is 'conscious politics' and not the ordinary kind of bigotry sooner or later to pass; it is a program, underway since 1967, to delegitimize and destroy the State of Israel." If states based on apartheid and racism are criminal states, he has explained, it follows that states based on ideologies designated as equivalent to them -- as is Israel on Zionism -- are criminal, and may be morally, legally and forcibly resisted by any national liberation movement. The PLO, of course, is recognized as a national liberation movement by the UN, based on prior recognition by the Arab League and the Organization of African Unity.

But the Zionism-equals-racism resolution stirred even more deeply-rooted anxieties among Jews and others aware of the role played by the myth of "international Zionism" in the rise and growth of modern anti-Semitism. The knew of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion,² the hate-spreading virus forged by the Czarist secret service early in this century, which had nourished Hitler's murderous hatred of Jews. To this day the Protocols are disseminated in many countries, their paranoid fantasies quoted or adapted by anti-Semitic propagandists in the Muslim as well as the Western world. The denigrating and scapegoating of Zionism in images and terms echoing the Protocols has been a practice of anti-Semites both of the right -- not very long ago by South Africa's right-wing exclusionists and more recently by the black Muslim bigot Farrakhan -- and the left. The depiction of Zionists as a capitalist-imperialist-reactionary cabal that rules and exploits the world was and is a staple of Soviet domestic and foreign propaganda.

To equate Zionism with racism, as Jews saw it, was a cynical anti-Semitic ploy. For the very notion of races as comprised of biologically immutable superior and inferior species, was actually an invention of 19th century bigots, conceived as a rationale for despising and discriminating against Jews, gypsies, blacks and other allegedly inferior racial groups. To label as racist the multi-colored, multi-ethnic and multi-religious society of Israel, with its many Muslim and Christian Arabs -- not to mention the diverse racial and ethnic groups within its Jewish community -- is palpably false.

Every Arab born in Israel, whether Muslim, Christian or Druse, is automatically a citizen of Israel by birth. Any foreigner, whatever his race, can apply to immigrate and become a nationalized citizen of Israel after meeting requirements similar to those in other democratic countries. As for the "Law of Return" which gives preferential treatment to Jews, it was enacted for the same reason the state itself was established - to solve, as stated in Israel's 1948 Declaration of Independence, the problem of the Jewish people's homelessness which was a cause of "the catastrophe which recently befell the Jewish people - the massacre of millions of Jews in Europe..." This Declaration proclaimed it to be the "right of the Jewish people to be masters of their own fate, like all other nations, in their own sovereign state," a right re-

cognized in the 1917 Balfour Declaration and reaffirmed in the League of Nations mandate which "gave international sanction to the historic connection between the Jewish people and Eretz-Israel..."

The 1948 Declaration also affirmed Israeli's commitment to "foster the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants," to "ensure complete equality of social and political equality" to all of them "irrespective of religion, race or sex," and to "guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture." And in fact, Israel's Arab citizens enjoy full religious, civil and political rights, except in limited respects involving national security considerations issuing from the ongoing Arab-Israel conflict, such as the restrictions on employment in defense-related industries.

As for the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, who do not enjoy the same rights as Israeli Jews and Arabs, their situation is a consequence of Israel's occupation of these territories in its successful 1967 war of self-defense, and the refusal of the Arab states as yet to negotiate a peace settlement. The restrictions on the inhabitants' rights, imposed for reasons of national security in the prevailing conditions of active hostility, are based on the international law rules applicable to belligerent occupations. Moreover, many if not most Arabs in these territories do not desire Israeli citizenship with its associated political rights, but seek self-determination in a state of their own.

The ancient Judaic belief in and hope of return to Zion, of restored Jewish nationhood in Palestine, which reappeared in the second half of the 19th century, came in the form of a reaction to the rise in anti-Semitism that accompanied the emancipation of Jews in Central and Western Europe. This anti-Semitism, highlighted by the Dreyfus Affair, convinced many Jews, even in advanced countries, of their vulnerability and the need for a Jewish state where they could determine their own destiny. Thus political Zionism can very correctly be said to be a national liberation movement, one of the earliest in the modern period, and it was in fact recognized as such for a brief interval by the Soviet Union when, in the Security Council in May 1948, its Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, so characterized it in criticizing the Arab States for sending their armies to crush the newly-created State of Israel.

The UN's resolution on Zionism did not surprise Jews, but it disturbed them nonetheless. Among the UN's most committed supporters in its early years, Jews had long since recognized (in Thomas Franck's characterization) that the UN's political organs "are not assemblages of judges or philosophers but of politicians" who are "not guided by ethical imperatives but by political considerations"; that the General Assembly is a "highly politicized conference of states" and "not the conscience of the world." Still, Jews and others were concerned that its pronouncements were accepted by well-intentioned UN "believers" and were disseminated worldwide by its far-reaching information services as well as by self-serving governments and political groups. They were worried that, as advertisers and political propagandists know, sloganized messages

repeated often enough affect how people view matters and can become part of their thoughts and feelings, even their "consciences."

The Non-aligned movement and Zionism-is-racism

In the General Assembly and in other UN bodies, specialized agencies, and special conferences, operating on the basis of the one-nation, one-vote rule, outcomes are mostly determined by the movement of non-aligned states (NAM) whose 101 members constitute nearly two-thirds the total UN membership of 159. In turn, the NAM includes several powerful, overlapping sub-blocs committed to the PLO's political cause: The 50 members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU); the 45 members of the Conference of Islamic States; the 22 members of the Arab League and, as nongovernmental members, the PLO and SWAPO, both recognized as national liberation movements and given a significant voice in matters pertaining to their specific concerns. Further stacking the deck against Israel in the NAM, and thence in the UN, are the Soviet surrogates, notably Cuba, whose influence in the NAM produced the sardonic comment that the movement was non-aligned on the side of Soviet positions. Though the NAM does not always side with the Soviet bloc -- it protested the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, for instance -- it has consistently taken strong positions against Israel.

As for the Cuba, in November 1975, it was not only among the three non-Arab sponsors of resolution 3379 but it also functioned as strategist and lobbyist for it. In 1977, Fidel Castro, ending a state visit to Libya, joined Muamar Khaddafi in expressing "full support" for the resolution and in condemning Israel for acting with South Africa against "the liberation struggle of the African and Arab peoples." And two years later, the Final Declaration of the Summit Conference of the NAM -- which Castro chaired during 1978-80 -- linked Zionism with apartheid as crimes against humanity, demanded its elimination from sport (!), and called on all UN members to join in establishing a standing committee to expose its crimes and conspiracies (!) against humanity and national liberation movements.

Thereafter, it became routine at NAM conferences to link Zionism with apartheid, racism, colonialism and other internationally condemned evils -- condemned that is, by predictable political determinations and not on the basis of any impartial, judicial-type consideration. At the NAM Summit meeting in New Delhi in March 1983, the leaders of the participating states termed the "struggle against...Zionism," along with that against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and apartheid as the very "quintessence of the policy of non-alignment..." So that, with NAM sponsorship and advocacy, UN endorsement and reaffirmation of Zionism-equals-racism was all but assured.

The PLO's UN Strategy

The PLO transferred its anti-Israel activities away from the military (except for the terrorism weapon) and toward the UN-centered battleground following Israel's successful defensive war in 1967, and especially after the 1973 Yom Kippur War. Even earlier, hostile references to Zionism were a staple of Arab as well as Soviet rhetoric in the UN, sometimes interspersed with undisguised anti-Semitic allusions. In 1965, for example, an Arab-Soviet bloc coalition successfully blocked a U.S.-Brazil amendment to add to the condemnation of apartheid in the Draft Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, a condemnation of anti-Semitism. The cynical tactic used by them to defeat the amendment was to pretend to agree if the sponsors, in exchange, would accept a sub-amendment to add a condemnation of Zionism, thus compelling withdrawal of the amendment. On another occasion, in December 1973, nearly two years before the Assembly's adoption of the Zionism-racism resolution, Arab and Soviet Bloc states persuaded it to condemn Zionism's "unholy alliance with Portuguese colonialism, South African racism and Israeli imperialism."

The Zionism-equals-racism strategy of the PLO and its Arab and Soviet allies was shrewd indeed - to link the anti-Zionism campaign to the UN's three most popular human rights causes with the largest constituencies worldwide: the struggles against apartheid, racism and sex discrimination. All three causes were already being promoted through manifold UN-sponsored educational and promotional programs with the participation of all parts of the UN system, including specialized agencies, as well as regional inter-governmental organizations, governments, and churches, professional associations, labor unions, schools, and other nongovernmental institutions.

In its campaign against Israel, the PLO counted on the Third World's ignorance about anti-Semitism and the Holocaust, and its confusion of Zionism with the occupied territories question. The PLO was equally aware of the reluctance of most European and Latin American governments to antagonize the oil-rich Arab states, and their tendency to straddle by abstaining in voting on controversial provisions affecting Israel rather than forthrightly rejecting the biased double-standard applied against it by voting a definite "no."

The anti-Zionism strategy scored its first major success in July 1975 at the widely-attended and publicized International Women's Year Conference in Mexico City, which launched a Decade of efforts to improve the situation of women worldwide. The Declaration adopted at Mexico City pronounced that "international peace and cooperation require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism (sic.), apartheid and racial discrimination in all its forms." (The Declaration was adopted by a vote of 89 in favor, 2 opposed -- U.S. and Israel -- and 18 abstentions.)

Resolution 3379

Even before proclaiming in 1975 the Women's Decade, the General Assembly had launched in December 1973 a UN Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and called on UN bodies and agencies, all governments, and nongovernmental groups and institutions throughout the world, to participate. Two sessions later, on October 16, 1975, the Assembly's Social and Humanitarian Committee adopted a resolution containing the infamous words, "Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination." It did so after Western opposition had forced withdrawal of proposed wording which tied this pronouncement specifically to the Decade against racism. (The vote in the Committee was 78 in favor, 29 against and 27 abstentions.) The Assembly's plenary, despite the vigorous and eloquent dissent of U.S. Ambassador Moynihan, and the opposition of all West European as well as some Latin American and African delegates, approved the Committee's resolution. Thereupon, the Somali spokesman for the sponsors -- unabashedly contradicting what had preceded -- stated that they had indeed intended linkage to the Decade.

The victory in the Assembly's plenary, in fact, was much less supportive of the Zionism-racism proponents than in the Committee: 72 in favor, 35 against, 32 abstentions and 3 absentees. The narrow, winning majority of the then total UN membership of 142 -- barely over half -- comprised 18 Arab states plus Muslim Iran and Turkey, 10 Asian states (substantially Muslim), 11 communist states, 22 black African states (many with Muslim majorities or influential minorities), 3 Latin American states (including Brazil and Mexico), and six others (see appendixes I and II). The U.S., Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the West European states -- all democracies -- voted no, as did 10 Latin American and 5 African states; and there were 12 black African, 11 Latin American and 8 Asian abstentions (plus 3 absentees, probably diplomatic).³

Israel's UN Ambassador (now its President) Chaim Herzog symbolically tore up the resolution on the Assembly's rostrum, rejecting it as an anti-Semitic assault against the Jewish people and religion. Ambassador Moynihan attacked it as a "political lie" constituting "a massive attack on the moral realities of the world." Other opponents stated that it confused racism with nationalism, that apartheid and Zionism had different histories and perspectives (Ethiopia), that the term "Black Zionism" had been used with a positive connotation in West Africa "to denote the movement to return to Africa the displaced Africans uprooted from their homelands and sold into slavery in the Western world" (Sierra Leone), that the UN should try to harmonize and not exacerbate differences, and that it is unfair to single out one country from among many where one form or degree of discrimination exists (Fiji).

The U.S. and other West European governments responded to the Assembly's action by ceasing participation in the UN Decade against racism and withholding their contributions to the financing of the world conference projected for 1983 as one of its main features.

Anti-Zionism Advances

The assault on Zionism was given a further impetus at the July 1980 mid-Decade Women's Conference in Copenhagen. At Mexico City, the hostile reference to Zionism had been limited to the Declaration adopted there, the PLO and its allies having failed to secure its inclusion in the Action Program adopted to implement it. This they achieved in Copenhagen where they succeeded in inserting in the Introduction to the Action Program a statement affirming that the Declaration's principles and aims are still relevant and constitute a basis of action for the Women's Decade, and another statement expressly mentioning Zionism in calling for inter-state cooperation in "the struggle to eliminate imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, zionism [sic], racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, hegemonism, and foreign occupation, domination and oppression..." (The Action Program as a whole, with the mention of Zionism in it, was adopted by 94 in favor, 4 against and 22 abstentions.)

The Action Program also included a PLO-inspired call to assist Palestinian and African women, the linkage being intended to highlight the purported similarity and symmetry of their situations, thereby co-opting to the PLO cause numerous African and other foes of apartheid. By this request, and by the incorporation of anti-Zionism in the Action Program, Copenhagen gave further encouragement to the UN Secretariat units sympathetic to the PLO to include opposition to Zionism in their informational and promotional activity.

Resolution 3379 and the Copenhagen conference gave a green light to ritual echoing of the Zionism-racism-apartheid linkage theme at subsequent inter-governmental conferences, where Zionism was depicted in ominous terms along with demands for punitive and remedial action. Thus, the OAU, in Nairobi in June 1981, condemned the "collusion between the Zionist regime and the racist regime of South Africa," and Israel's "expansionist and racist policy" which threatened the Mideast and "the world as a whole," and affirmed that "armed struggle against the racists in South Africa and Palestine is the most effective way of putting an end to the policy of expansion and domination over the Arab and African people." The African regional Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, adopted by the OAU the same month in Banjul, Gambia, declared it the "duty" of the people of Africa to join in the struggle to liberate Africa (!) from Zionism (preamble, para.8). This provision, reported to have been imposed by PLO supporters on threat of blocking approval of the entire Charter, went all but unnoticed by nongovernmental proponents of regional human rights agreements, who consider this Charter a historic achievement and hope that enough states will ratify it so as to bring it into force and build on it African regional implementing mechanisms.

A UN-sponsored regional seminar on "The Palestine Question," in Dakar, Senegal, in August 1982, recommended that nongovernmental organizations be enlisted in a global campaign to publicize, "especially in Africa, the Caribbean, and the African-American communities in the United

States," the ties, similarities, and "even identity" between Zionism and apartheid. At this seminar, invited "experts" from the U.S., reporting the purported views of Black Americans, described Palestine and Namibia as Arab and African countries "linked as hostages to Zionism, racism and imperialism," and described to receptive listeners the purported grasping role of Jews in American society who were "prospering at the expense of black people."

A year later, in August 1983 in Geneva, a UN-sponsored international conference on "The Palestine Question" approved an Action Program calling on all states to consider ways to meet "the threat that Israel poses to regional security in Africa" because it collaborates with the apartheid regime. At this conference, the Secretary-General of the Conference of Islamic States repeated the Zionism-equals-racism refrain, and predicted ominously that Israel will pursue its goal of a "great empire stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates."

Thereafter, the linking of Zionism with racism and apartheid and with the standard litany of other international evils was ritually reaffirmed in resolutions of the NAM, the OAU, the Islamic Conference, and the Arab League. Arab and Muslim states, and radical African and Soviet bloc states, regularly linked Zionism to racism in their UN speeches, and the Zionist-racism slogan was echoed by elites and ordinary people in the Middle East, Africa and Asia, especially in the Arab and other predominantly Muslim countries, in Eastern Europe, and even in some circles in the democratic West including elements of the U.S. black community.

Combating Resolution 3379

The outcome of the Copenhagen conference elated the PLO and its supporters, but the ugly anti-Israel and anti-U.S. political atmosphere there in both the official conference and the NGO Forum evoked a strongly adverse reaction from governmental and nongovernmental circles in the U.S. as well as other Western countries. Even many committed UN defenders, not least among them the UN Secretary-General, were troubled by the damaging impact of Copenhagen on the UN's reputation. Perhaps most persuasive were threats from the U.S. President and Congress that henceforth the U.S. would walk out of overly politicized conferences, including those which malign Zionism, and would withhold from its assessed membership dues owed the UN an amount equal to 25% of the cost of the particular "tainted" conferences (or other programs), which corresponds to the proportion paid by the U.S. of the combined dues of all the members combined.

After Copenhagen, Jewish communal groups in the U.S. and other countries increased their counter-action efforts, including educational programs to explain the history and real meaning of Zionism. Changes in the Arab world -- splits within the PLO and between the moderate and radical Arab states, the weakening of petropower, and beginnings of African disenchantment with the Arab alliance -- encouraged hopes for a slowing if not reversal of the anti-Zionism tide in the UN.

A portent of change in governmental attitudes was the huge number of delegations that abstained or absented themselves from voting on the inclusion of an invidious reference to Zionism in documents of the Second UNESCO Conference on World Cultural Policy in Mexico City, in the summer of 1982. (Only 45 voted in favor with 29 against while 75 (!) abstained or were diplomatically absent.) The following year, in August 1983 in Geneva, at the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held to mark the end of the Decade against racism, the PLO and its allies suffered a clear defeat in their effort to secure reaffirmation on the Zionism-equals-racism formula. But the most significant defeat to date occurred at the end-of-Decade Women's Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, in July 1985.

During the preparatory stages leading up to the official conference at Nairobi -- which was preceded by an unofficial NGO Forum attended by thousands of women from all parts of the world -- the U.S. delegation made very clear, as warned by the President and mandated by the Congress, that if the Zionism-racism theme was repeated in the concluding document of the conference, it would walk out, not approve the document, and not participate in UN activities based on it. This time, Israel and the U.S. were joined in the walk-out threat by Australia and Canada. The West European governments, as well as -- behind the scenes in NAM caucuses and at the conference itself -- most Latin American and some African states also opposed the insidious reference to Zionism. The Kenyan host state and the UN Secretary-General, anxious for a successful conference, were particularly helpful.

The Zionism-racism issue was focused in paragraph 95 of the conference's draft 370-paragraph final document on "Forward-Looking Strategies" for advancing the situation of women, which set forth goals and activities to be carried on to the year 2000. The controversial wording cited Zionism together with the usual litany of apartheid, racism, imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, etc., as an obstacle to the advancement of women. This paragraph was one of many others advocated by the Soviet bloc and the "Group of 77" (whose membership, now numbering many more, is virtually congruent with the NAM) that had been placed in brackets to indicate disagreement among the member governments.

A key procedural disagreement concerned the question of consensus as basis for decision-making as advocated by the U.S. and other Western members. These and other governments could not persuade the Soviet bloc and Third World delegations to adopt such a general rule for the conference overall, among other reasons because it could set a precedent for future conferences. However these delegations were compelled by the many-sided opposition to the pejorative reference to Zionism to yield on this specific issue, by accepting Kenya's suggestion to substitute for the reference to Zionism in a laundry list of international evils including apartheid and racism, which are obstacles to the advancement of women, the phrase "and all other forms of racism," without mentioning Zionism at all. In exchange, the U.S., the Western European and some

other delegations, after winning a number of other changes in the draft final document, agreed, on July 29, 1985, to adopt the whole document by consensus.

The PLO representative did not accept this defeat, stating for the record that: "Our understanding of the [Kenyan] amendment is based on the UN resolution that Zionism is a form of racism and it is on this understanding that we accept the amendment."

The final document also included a controversial paragraph (no. 307) on Palestinian women and children (adopted by a roll-call vote of 97 in favor, 3 against -- Australia, Israel, US -- with 29 abstentions). This strongly-worded paragraph included references to the situation in southern Lebanon and the Golan Heights as well as the West Bank and Gaza, and it called for implementation of all "relevant" UN resolutions as well as the Program of Action for Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held in Geneva, August 29-September 2, 1983. This program had laid out an elaborate global educational and diplomatic plan for promoting the Palestinian cause under PLO leadership.

Despite the two important defeats of the effort to secure reaffirmations of the Zionism-racism accusation, it is premature to conclude that the PLO and its radical allies, Arab and other, have given up this goal, whether in respect to the UN or to governments and nongovernmental groups outside it.

Future Prospects and Remedies

Several suggestions have been made as to what can be done to to the Zionism-racism resolution. UN Under Secretary-General James Jonah, a Ghanian, addressing this question at a public meeting in December 1984, assured representatives of American Jewish organizations that the General Assembly is not automatically anti-Israel. When Third World countries condemn Israel, he said, they do so from what they feel is principled opposition to all foreign occupations, as shown by their positions on Afghanistan, Kampuchea, the Falklands (Malvinas) and Grenada. In the first two instances, Mr. Jonah noted, the occupiers are the Soviet Union and Vietnam; in the other two, they were the United Kingdom and the U.S. Most Third World nations, he explained, do not understand what Zionism signifies historically and also have little knowledge of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust. To them, Zionism means Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and the unhappy situation of the Palestinians. Moreover, he added, it is a fact that many Africans voted against or abstained in 1975 on the Zionism-racism resolution, which would not have been adopted had abstentions been counted.

Mr. Jonah recommended that to reverse the UN's anti-Zionism stand, Israel, with the help of Jewish communal groups and others concerned,

need to bring to Third World governments and people understanding of the truth about Zionism and the facts about Israel today.

Clearly, these governments and people, their elites, media and wider publics must be educated, to the extent possible, about these subjects. At the same time, Israel's human rights practices, and the image they project abroad, are important. Its official response to Sabra-Shatila -- holding its highest military officials indirectly responsible -- clearly enhance that image. So does the condemnation of Rabbi Meir Kahane by Israel's President as well as the Israeli Knesset's banning, in effect, of his political movement. Correspondingly, reports of support for Kahane in Israel, especially among the young, harms the campaign against the Zionism-racism libel.

Though a Mideast political settlement satisfactory to Israel and the Palestinians could render moot the whole issue of Zionism-racism, unhappily, the Protocols demonstrates how long-lived and resistant to reality irrational myths and hatreds can be.

Finally, some suggest that the U.S. and other democratic governments, while continuing to support the UN Charter ideals, should begin (as they have to a degree) to resist more vigorously some of unwholesome patterns in the present functioning of the organization -- vote-trading and bloc voting, the double-standard, politicization, confrontation rather than harmonization, abuse of rules of procedure, secretariat partisanship. If such conditions should not improve, they should curtail correspondingly their financing of and their participation in the questionable UN bodies and programs, while exploring alternative forms of inter-governmental collaboration.

* * *

President Ronald Reagan, in his memorable speech in the General Assembly on October 24, 1985, on the occasion of the UN's 40th anniversary, took note of "the total inversion of morality in the infamous Zionism-is-racism resolution." Secretary of State George Shultz, also in an address in observance of the 40th anniversary, cautioned governments against treating the UN bodies as arenas for "name-calling, for ideological and political confrontation" and -- citing the Zionism-racism resolution -- "as a platform for voices of hatred and bigotry." Other leaders of the free nations, and citizen groups everywhere should be encouraged to speak out in the same vein.

- 1 An Arab woman participant in last July's UN world conference on women's rights in Nairobi, Kenya, in commenting on the controversy surrounding the Zionism-racism issue, responded in this vein before she was apparently reproved by her colleagues that Zionism was not a simple matter of racial discrimination and that it was important to continue to describe it as racism.

- 2 The exposure of the Protocols as forgeries, Henry Ford's widely advertised 1920 apology for publishing them in his Detroit newspaper, and the overthrow of Czarism and of Hitler, did not stop their dissemination. They continue to this day to surface in many countries, especially in the Arab and Islamic world. In 1968, the Protocols was published in hundreds of thousands of copies in French and English by an Islamic Institute in Beirut. In 1972, Khaddafi recommended it in a speech to Western journalists. In 1974, a delegation of Muslim religious scholars from Saudi Arabia distributed copies during an invited visit to the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France.

V.S. Naipul, in his fascinating 1982 book, Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey, recounts being lectured by a religious teacher in an Islamic commune in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia about Jews, inventors of evolution, "degraded in the eyes of the world," the "enemies of God," and told of a bookshop where he could obtain "the book by Henry Ford, the motorman." More recently, an exhibitor at a government-sponsored Islamic exhibit in Stockholm, Sweden, in August 1985, abusing the trust of the local Historical Museum, offered for sale copies of the Protocols.

- 3 On a proposal to defer action on the resolution, even fewer -- 67 -- voted against deferral, that is, supported proceeding with the vote on the proposed Zionism-equals-racism determination. 55 voted for deferral -- with the implied intention that the Assembly not return to the subject -- 15 abstained and 5 were absent, a total of 75 out of the 142 UN members.

APPENDIX I

UN MEMBER STATES VOTING IN FAVOR OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3379
EQUATING ZIONISM WITH RACISM
NOVEMBER 10, 1975

*Countries espousing non-alignment as of
December 1981.

Arab and/or Muslim (20)	Asian (10)	African (22)	Latin American (3)	Communist (11)	Other (6)
* Algeria	* Afghanistan	Burundi	Brazil	Albania	Cyprus
* Bahrain	* Bangladesh	Cape Verde	* Cuba	Bulgaria	* Grenada
* Democratic Yemen	Cambodia	Chad	Mexico	Byelorussia	* Guyana
* Egypt	China	Congo		Cyprus	Maldives
* Iran (non-Arab)	* India	* Equatorial Guinea		Czechoslovakia	Malta
* Iraq	* Indonesia	* Gambia		Democratic German Republic	Portugal
* Jordan	* Laos	* Guinea		Hungary	
* Kuwait	* Malaysia	* Guinea-Bissau		Mongolia	
* Lebanon	* Pakistan	* Madagascar		Poland	
* Libya	* Sri Lanka	* Mali		Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	
* Morocco		* Mauritania		USSR	
* Oman		* Mozambique		* Yugoslavia	
* Qatar		* Niger			
* Saudi Arabia		* Nigeria			
* Sudan		* Rwanda			
* Syria		Sao Tome and Principe			
* Tunisia		* Senegal			
Turkey (non-Arab)		* Somalia			
* United Arab Emirates		* Uganda			
* Yemen		* Cameroon			
		* Tanzania			

Prepared by Division of International Organizations,
American Jewish Committee

APPENDIX II

The Table shows: total population; Muslims as a % of total population; major divisions in the Muslim population; Monarchy (M) or Republic (R); membership in the Arab League (AL), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

Member	Total population (000s)	Muslims as % of population	Major divisions in the Muslim population ¹	M or R	AL	OAU	OPEC
I ARAB							
Algeria	18,250	98	Sunni ²	R	X	X	X
Bahrain	260	97	Sunni 50%; Shi'i 50%	M	X		
Egypt ³	38,070	93	Sunni	R	X ⁴	X	
Iraq	12,171	95	Sunni 40%; Shi'i 60%	R	X		X
Jibouti	220	99	Sunni	R	X	X	
Jordan	2,780	95	Sunni 94%; Shi'i 6%	M	X		
Kuwait	1,030	100	Sunni 77%; Shi'i 23%	M	X		X
Lebanon	2,960	57	Sunni 45%; Shi'i 55%	R	X		
Libya ⁵	2,900	100	Sunni	R	X	X	X
Mauritania	1,420	100	Sunni	R	X	X	
Morocco	17,830	99	Sunni	M	X		
Oman	1,500	100	Sunni 25%; Ibadi ⁶ 73%	M	X		
PLO					X ⁷		
Qatar	140	100	Sunni (Wahhabi sect ⁸)	M	X		X
Saudi Arabia	9,240	100	Sunni 96% (Wahhabi 50%); Shi'i 4%	M	X		X
Somalia	3,260	100	Sunni	R	X	X	
Sudan	16,130	85	Sunni	R	X	X	
Syria	7,600	88	Sunni 79.5%; Shi'i 20.5% (Alawi ⁹ 70%)	R	X		
Tunisia	6,070	95	Sunni	R	X	X	
United Arab Emirates	656	100	Sunni 92%; Shi'i 3%; Ibadi 5%	M	X		X
Yemen (Arab Republic)	6,870	95	Sunni 60%; Shi'i 40%	R	X		
Yemen (People's Democratic Republic)	1,750	99	Sunni 92%; Shi'i 8%	R	X		
II NON-ARAB AFRICAN							
Cameroon	7,600	20	Sunni	R		X	
Chad	4,120	45	Sunni	R		X	
Comoros	310	95	Sunni	R		X	
Gabon	534	10-30 ¹⁰	Sunni	R		X	X
Gambia	540	90	Sunni	R		X	
Guinea	5,390	95	Sunni	R		X	
Guinea Bissau	777	35	Sunni	R		X	
Mali	6,300	65	Sunni	R		X	
Niger	5,352	85	Sunni	R ¹¹		X	
Senegal	5,135	80	Sunni	R		X	
Uganda	11,940	10-30 ¹²	Sunni	R		X	
Upper Volta	6,170	15-40 ¹³	Sunni	R		X	
III NON-ARAB ASIAN							
Afghanistan ¹⁴	19,280	99	Sunni 80%; Shi'i 20%	R			
Bangladesh	76,815	85	Sunni	R			
Indonesia	136,044	95	Sunni	R			X
Iran	33,900	98	Sunni 4.5%; Shi'i 95.5%	R			X
Malaysia	11,900	52	Sunni	M			
Maldives	119	100	Sunni	R			
Pakistan	70,260	97	Sunni	R			
Turkey	40,160	99	Sunni 85%; Shi'i 15%	R			

1 Sunni is the main and orthodox stream of Islam. Shi'i is the minority. The Sunni-Shi'i schism developed from the political conflict which followed the election of Ali (Muhammad's cousin, adopted son, and son-in-law) to the Caliphate in 656. Ali was killed in 661 and the Caliphate was transferred to the Umayyad family. The Shia (*Shiat Ali* - the party of Ali), failing to restore leadership to the house of Ali, developed an intricate theology with many dogmas repugnant to orthodox Islam.

2 Where only 'Sunni' appears, all other Muslims are a small minority about whom no precise information was available.

3 Membership in the OIC suspended in May 1979 following the signing of the Camp David accords and the peace treaty with Israel.

4 Membership in the Arab League suspended in March 1979. 5 Libya calls itself *jumhuriya* from the Arabic *jumahir* (the plural of *junhur*) which means 'masses'.

6 The Ibadiya is a moderate form of the extremist Kharijite sect which developed from the Arab party that revolted against Ali before his death.

7 'Palestine' is considered an independent state by the Arab League and the PLO is recognized as its representative.

8 The Wahhabis follow the teachings of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab who, in the eighteenth century, advocated a puritanical exegesis of the faith according to the Hanbali school.

9 Alawis (or Nusairis) are an offshoot of the Shia whose syncretist beliefs include the main tenets of the Ismailis (the 'Seveners', who regard Ismail as the rightful seventh and last Imam) and a liturgy which contains many Christian borrowings.

10 Published estimates range from 1-40%.

11 Constitution suspended in April 1974.

12 Published estimates range from 5-36%.

13 Published estimates range from 9-56%.

14 Membership in the OIC suspended in January 1980 following the Soviet invasion.

Sources: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition* (Leiden and London, 1960-1980); *The Europa Yearbook 1979. A World Survey. Vols I & II* (London 1979); *The Middle East Yearbook 1979* (London 1979); *Annuaire de l'Afrique et du moyen-orient* (Paris 1979); *The Middle East and North Africa 1979-80* (London 1979); G.A. Shpazhnikov, *Religii stran zapadnoy Azii* (Religions of the countries of Western Asia) (Moscow 1976); Sydney Nettleton Fisher, *The Middle East: A History* (2nd ed.: London 1971); Manazir Ahsan, *Islam: Faith and Practice* (Leicester 1977).

Reprinted from Research Report, no. 19, Institute of Jewish Affairs, (London, December 1980).