

UNITED NATIONS - Anti-Zionism / AJC

BLAUSTEIN  
LIBRARY

MAY 1 1991

American Jewish  
Committee

---

# THE EFFORT TO *REPEAL* RESOLUTION 3379

---

An American Jewish Committee Conference  
November 8, 1990 at the United States Mission  
to the United Nations, New York, New York



---

**THE EFFORT  
TO *REPEAL*  
RESOLUTION  
3379**

---

An American Jewish Committee Conference  
November 8, 1990 at the United States Mission  
to the United Nations, New York, New York

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

Sholom D. Comay, president

David A. Harris, executive vice president

The November 8, 1990 conference was chaired by Alfred H. Moses, chair of the board of governors of the American Jewish Committee.

This publication was prepared by Kenneth S. Stern, program specialist on anti-Semitism and extremism for the American Jewish Committee.

## FOREWORD

It was a remarkable four hours.

One after another diplomats, politicians, religious and ethnic leaders addressed an American Jewish Committee gathering at the United States Mission to the United Nations. Resolution 3379, the infamous United Nations equation of Zionism with racism, was turning fifteen years old, and no one was willing to let it age gracefully.

Leading up to the fifteenth anniversary, many well-intentioned people said that the effort to repeal Resolution 3379 should be put on "hold." The American Jewish Committee disagreed, believing that there is never a wrong time to oppose bigotry, especially bigotry codified into law. The speakers at the United States Mission agreed. Resolution 3379 continues to be a corrosive on the fiber of the United Nations. It continues to promote anti-Semitism. It continues to justify a double-standard for Israel. And it continues to retard the peace process.

Bulgaria. Poland. Hungary. Czechoslovakia. These Central and Eastern European countries had voted for Resolution 3379 in 1975. On November 8, 1990, at the United States Mission, they explained those votes. These had not been free votes. Ambassadors had been forced to support the slanderous draft proposed by the Soviet and Arab bloc. They knew then, and they know now, that Resolution 3379 was "slanderous, false, an expression of anti-Semitic propaganda." These countries, recently emerged from communism, will not only vote for 3379's repeal -- they promised to work actively to get other nations to do the same.

On November 8, 1990, ethnic and religious leaders from around the country sent a statement to the meeting. Referring to themselves as "American's United Nations," they termed 3379 an "insult." They demanded its repeal.

November 8, 1990 was a day of emotion, intellect, and rousing speeches, including exceptional remarks from Senator Daniel Moynihan, Ambassador Thomas Pickering and Israeli Ambassador Yoram Aridor.

What follows is an edited version of the conference. When Resolution 3379 is repealed, the speeches of November 8, 1990 will be remembered as a turning point -- the day when the resolution existence was not longer bemoaned, but instead its demise begun.

Sholom D. Comay  
*President,*  
*American Jewish Committee*

David A Harris  
*Executive Vice President,*  
*American Jewish Committee*

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR THOMAS PICKERING  
United States Representative to the  
United Nations

Today, we are gathered to mark the fifteenth anniversary of the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, which declares that Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, is a form of racism. I will not dwell on that degrading episode in United Nations history, because there are others here who have written and published lucidly on that inglorious era, most notably, Senator Moynihan sitting here with me.

Instead, I want to share with you the concrete and positive steps that the United States and the U.S. Mission to the U.N. are taking in the fight against this preposterous statement. The U.S. has always stated its position clearly and forcibly, and we will continue always to make our views known on this issue. We believe that the resolution equating Zionism and racism is a falsehood. It is anti-Semitism and a slander of mammoth proportions. We reiterate that we will not continue to sit in a United Nations which does not include the state of Israel. We continue to work actively for the renunciation, the repeal, of this resolution. Vice President Quayle, in December 1989, publicly called for the repeal of the resolution, and he called upon the United Nations and the Secretary General to help. It is long overdue that all member states of the United Nations join us in renouncing Resolution 3379.

While the United States continues to emphasize the illegitimacy of the resolution and to press for its repeal, we have been in close touch with the government of Israel, which is the state most affected by this resolution. We have been careful not to bring the issue prematurely to a vote, feeling that any lost vote would be a re-ratification of the resolution rather than its overturning. We have consulted closely with several of our allies including Israel, and we have been in touch with key Arab countries about the possibilities of overturning the resolution. The consensus, including the view of Israel, was though the time was not now right to seek reversal, we should always be ready for the time when we might move.

The government of Israel has made this clear to the United States. They told us: "A moral victory almost nullifying the resolution would not be a satisfactory solution to Israel, even if the number of votes in support of its position was substantially higher than in 1975." Israel wants to be certain that any effort to reverse the resolution will succeed comfortably.

With this in mind, the United States has begun an active campaign to work diplomatically on possible strategies and tactics for repeal of 3379 as soon as we can muster the votes. First we are consulting with the thirty-five countries that joined us in opposing the resolution in 1975. We are doing this to reiterate our belief that the resolution must be rescinded, urging their support for repeal, and soliciting their views regarding coordination on appropriate strategy and timing.

Second, we are consulting with numerous countries that originally voted for the resolution, but which have subsequently acquired new governments and new thinking.

Third, we are consulting with countries that either abstained or were absent in 1975, or which joined the United Nations after that date, some twenty-nine in number.

Finally, we are working and consulting with Arab governments, making the same points which Vice President Quayle, Secretary Baker, and the President have effectively made, that reversal would help to facilitate the peace process by sending a clear signal to Israel that the Arab side is now ready for reconciliation, thereby assuring Israel about Arab intentions.

As I have noted, we still have work to do, but I can say at this point that we see distinct signs of movement by several governments that originally voted in favor of Resolution 3379 either toward opposition to the concept that Zionism is racism, or at least toward abstention on any vote coming up, which is, of course, an important vote in our favor. Among the countries that abstained last time or did not vote or were not members of the U.N. in 1975, we have seen a similar movement toward opposing the concept that underlies Resolution 3379. Moreover, within this category we have seen no falling back, no retrograde movement toward supporting the resolution. Finally, the thirty-five member nations that courageously opposed Resolution 3379 in 1975 appear to be remaining steadfast.

To conclude, I welcome the opportunity to have you here in the Mission, to have you hear a number of important speakers on this occasion, and to review with you what we are doing in terms of our policy and approach toward repealing 3379. We continue to oppose the resolution and all that it stands for.

I would like to leave with you one more thought from the oft-quoted and much-studied tractate of the Mishnah known as *Pirkei Avot*, the Ethics of the Fathers: "The task is long and the day is short: While it is not your duty to complete the task, neither are you free to shirk completing your portion of it."

I am proud to be serving as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations at a time when the task is indeed long. I want you to know that the U.S. is not shirking its obligations to combat the unceasing battle to delegitimize the State of Israel, and with it the shared foundations of Western democratic values and ideals which we all cherish.

Remarks of  
U.S. SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN\* (D-N.Y.)

We have a problem here. We have a problem of an obscene, hurtful event that took place fifteen years ago. Our ambassador described it as a slander of monumental proportions, as a falsehood. It was all that. Fifteen years ago this week, the United Nations grafted anti-Semitism into law. It did take place and it hasn't been undone. Why?

I'll tell you why. For every person who thinks that it was a serious event, there is someone of importance who thinks it wasn't. Last evening, my wife and I happened to run into one of the most distinguished Israeli diplomats of this generation. I mentioned our meeting today and the resolution, and he said of the resolution, "It was an event of monumental unimportance." And that was the view that was held right here in this mission fifteen years ago. Then the Israeli U.N. ambassador, Chaim Herzog, and I thought it was a matter of large importance. Our respective governments thought it was a matter of no importance. And that pattern continues. If we don't get this out and talk it out, we're never going to reverse that vote.

As for the event itself, we did not mistake its import. It took us by surprise. There was no hint of it until the Mexico City Conference on the International Year of the Woman. It showed up in the Third Committee after we had a special session on North-South relations which ended up with unanimous agreement, the first time ever, instead of that normal deadlock. BANG! It came without any real warning. I remember saying, "What we are witnessing is not merely one of the routine degradations of the United Nations and its ideals; it is, unless we can stand in its way, the most crippling blow yet dealt in the irreversible decline of the concern with human rights as we now know it."

The vote of November 10 wasn't quite as lopsided as it ended up. On the Belgian motion to recommit, as we would say in the House and Senate, we lost 67 to 55, with five abstentions. It was that close, and the feeling about it was strong. We stood up and said, "The terrible lie that has been told here will have terrible consequences. When the language of human rights is abused," I remember saying, "the day will come when terms like 'national self-determination' and 'national honor' will be exploited in the same way." And there's a nice passage somewhere where I say, "On what grounds will others be moved to defend and protect it?" The language of human rights, the only language by which the small can be defended, is no longer believed and no longer has a power of its own. The Kuwaitis might think about that today because they were prominent among those who were for this resolution fifteen years ago.

There was always ambivalence about arguing against it. Two or three weeks later, there was a very luxurious dinner at the Iranian embassy. My wife was sitting next to the French ambassador there, a very distinguished man, later a minister, and one of *les ambassadeurs de France*, five people who had the rank that Pickering has. Liz was saying, "That was a bad fall we had. God, that was awful."

And the ambassador, a lucid, intelligent, top-of-the-line French diplomat, said, "Well, you know, we never would have lost that vote if it hadn't been for your husband's speech."

---

\* Senator Moynihan's speech departed from his prepared text, which was also distributed at the meeting. His prepared text follows his extemporaneous remarks.

And she said, "Oh?"

And he said, "Yes."

She said, "Why?"

He said, "Well, it was so intemperate."

She said, "Well, yeah, but he gave it after the vote was taken."

It's called a speech in explanation of vote. I gave it *after* the vote. We didn't want anybody to say, "If you hadn't said all those things, I'd have voted with you." And yet the French ambassador, in three weeks' time, was prepared to say, "Well, the Americans blew it. It wouldn't have happened excepting . . ." That kind of thing.

What did happen? We did find out -- our ambassadors didn't find out, but the scholars did, notably Bernard Lewis and Charles Fairbanks. The proposition that Zionism is a form of racism originated in a two-part article in *Pravda* that appeared on February 18 and 19 in 1971. It was headed, "Anti-Sovietism: The Profession of the Zionists." It was written by a then 34-year-old author named Vladimir Bolshakov, who was deputy secretary of *Pravda's* editorial board. He is now *Pravda's* chief correspondent in Paris. We know where he is and who he was.

The proposition was very simple. He asserted in the official newspaper of the Community Party of the Soviet Union that the Jews, far from being victims of the Nazis, had been their collaborators. He wrote, for example, "Zionist agents active during the last war in Western and Eastern Europe and in the occupied part of the Soviet Union collaborated with the Nazis. Many cases are known where the Gestapo recruited overseers from the Zionists." It even said that the massacre at Babi Yar was carried out by the Zionists.

Now, I'm not a psychologist, but that kind of gets you in the gut. It's become very clear to me over the last fifteen years that there are some things people will not hear. I wrote all this up and published it. In the early '80s, maybe the late '70s, the Holocaust Commission that we had established visited Babi Yar, and I read in the *New York Times* that they were astounded to find there was no reference to the Jews who died there, which meant that the Holocaust Commission had not absorbed the fact that the official version of the Soviet Union is that the Jews did it.

You don't like that, do you? I can just feel it out there. You don't like hearing that. I don't blame you. I wouldn't like to hear it either. It has its power. It silences. Certainly it held on.

The fascinating thing is that it was not until 1984 that the distinguished Irishman Chaim Herzog became president of Israel, and that's the first time a conference met in Israel on this issue. He used the president's reception room to do it. All those universities you've been giving money to all these years? They were probably lost in prayer -- or whatever. I mean, a few people came down from Mount Scopus and gave us three and a half pages of nothing. I came over and gave a paper, and the then ambassador from Costa Rica, who was very damn good, came.

In 1987, President Herzog was coming here for his first state visit as president, and we were going to have a joint meeting with all members [of Congress]. I called him and said, "Would this be a good time for Congress to adopt a resolution on the Zionism resolution?"

He said, "Yes. As a matter of fact, I was in Australia and they did."



So we had the good thought that the U.S. Congress, instead of making up our own resolution which would go on too long, why don't we just get hold of the Australian resolution. It consisted of four clear, crisp points, written in English, and we decided, "Why don't we adopt, word for word, their resolution, and then send it around the world and see if others won't do the same."

Well, it took a long time. It's just beginning to happen, but I can report that the parliaments of Argentina, Belgium, Peru, the Netherlands, and Uruguay have passed this resolution as of this date. Canadians haven't -- they should. And so with the European parliament.

But the key to the entire matter is that the Soviets begin to appear to want to repudiate what was *their* act. If you don't know that it's *their* act, don't get into this business.

We had a hearing this March 30 on the subject in the Foreign Relations Committee. A Department of State representative said to us, "The Soviets have assured us that the resolution represents a concept that is no longer acceptable according to the new political thinking of the Soviet Union." And that does appear to be the case. The Soviets have made what is clearly a decision to try to work within this U.N. system. On December 7 of 1988, Mr. Gorbachev came here, spoke to the General Assembly, and as clearly as you could do, said, "We have changed our mind. We're going to work here." He summoned up from his school days the Latin phrase which, in translation, means "agreements must be kept." It's a term of international law. He was very explicit.

A few months later, [Eduard] Shevardnadze, his foreign minister, was in Paris where he addressed the Council of UNESCO, something no Soviet leader had ever done before. Talking about the departure from UNESCO of three respected members, meaning the United States, the U.K., and Singapore -- when we left over the "new international order" in the press and exclusion of Israel from any regional group in UNESCO -- he said that this was regrettable. I'm quoting him. "We don't try to shift the blame on others. We submitted to the influence of confrontation and adopted its spirit as we sought to repulse ideas alien to us. The exaggerated ideological approach undermined tolerance intrinsic to UNESCO." Now, that's a big statement from the foreign minister of a country that has 4,000 nuclear warheads. They have changed their minds. But we don't give them much response. We haven't really brought them into this, as far as I can tell.

What immoral regimes will create, moral ones will quickly repudiate. When [Vaclav] Havel became president of Czechoslovakia, one of the first things he did was travel to Jerusalem and publicly announce he was reversing his nation's position on this.

If others would do that, we could get those votes. There's one simple, elemental strategy. There are now about 159 U.N. members; the non-aligned would come to 120. You have to go to the non-aligned and tell them, "You lost. You backed wrong. You backed Soviet, and you're in a lot of trouble now. Nobody needs your votes and nobody has any money to spare, and you're all on your own. The countries that prevailed in that long encounter have won, no thanks to you. If you need any aid, don't look to the Soviet Union; they're looking to us, too, and they have changed their minds about some things. Now, have you changed your mind about anything? Any resolutions you might have voted for? Remember November 10, 1975? Remember that?"

Why don't our men and women in those capitals go in there and say, "Fellows, friends, you bet wrong. You bet that the Soviets were the next stage in history, and they are not. They're falling apart. They do nothing for you, and they can't do anything to you, either." But somehow we don't say that. I mean, we could go to them and say, "The Soviet judge has just sent a Pamyat leader to jail." You know, that's a fact. Talk about Zionism and racism. I'm not talking about the regeneration of Russia; I don't know anything about that. But I know their formal policy of state.

I don't know why we don't press it. The Vice President did, indeed, come up to Yeshiva [University] here in New York for the annual Hanukkah dinner and said, "We're going to make an issue of this," but now we've dropped back again, and it's not the first time. We keep getting this business of "we don't want to lose." Well, yeah, we don't want to lose. That's why you count. And we don't want to take a vote where we're going to lose. But when are we taking a count? You don't say in advance, "We wouldn't want to lose; therefore, we aren't going to find out whether we can win." There's something the matter, and I don't know what it is, but something resists this. While we are not clearly together, nothing's going to happen. And yet it's clear to me, on the other hand, that we can do this. We have to get the Russians to say yes. Eastern Europe has already done that. Go to the non-aligned and say, "Last chance to get on board. This train is leaving, and we don't need that embassy, we don't need your votes. Get yourself straight on this issue or forget about anything from us or the rest of the world." I think it can be done. I think we ought to do it.

Prepared Remarks of  
U.S. SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN (D-N.Y.)

I am pleased to be here this morning, and to join Ambassador Pickering and so many of his colleagues, at this important event marking the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, which found Zionism to be a form of "racism and racial discrimination."

The American Jewish Committee was one of the very few groups that was with us in this struggle from the beginning, fifteen years ago, and it is most appropriate that you are hosting today's meeting.

I was the Permanent Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations at that time and I watched with increasing dismay and indignation as this obscene resolution swept through the Third Committee. I warned during the Third Committee debate that "what we are witnessing is not merely one of the routine degradations of the United Nations and its ideals. It is, unless we can stand in its way, the most crippling blow yet dealt in the irreversible decline of the concern with human rights as we know it."

When the General Assembly voted on November 10, 1975 the outcome was never in question. On the key Belgian motion to adjourn debate, we lost by a margin of 67 to 55, with 5 abstentions. The General Assembly having spoken in its collective wisdom, I rose to announce that "the United States of America declares that it does not acknowledge, it will not abide by, it will never acquiesce to this infamous act." And yet, I predicted, while the United States would never accept this resolution, "The terrible lie that has been told here will have terrible consequences. . . . There will be new forces, some of them arising now, new prophets and new despots, who will justify their actions with the help of just such distortions of words as we have sanctioned here today. Today we have drained the word racism of its meaning. Tomorrow, terms like 'national self-determination' and 'national honor' will be perverted in the same way to serve the purposes of conquest and exploitation. And when these claims begin to be made -- as they have already begun to be made -- it is the small nations of the world whose integrity will suffer. . . . On what grounds will others be moved to defend and protect them, when the language of human rights, the only language by which the small can be defended, is no longer believed and no longer has a power of its own?"

And so it has been. In Israel the resolution was widely perceived as yet another good reason to not trust the United Nations. In the United States, the reaction of most Americans to Resolution 3379 was to ignore it. We thought much less of the United Nations and continued to support the State of Israel and respect Zionism as if this ugly resolution never existed. But it does exist, and in many parts of the world United Nations resolutions are considered with far more attention than we grant them. In Scandinavia, New Zealand and in much of the Third World, the General Assembly's writ is endowed with much more significance than it ever enjoyed in this country, even in the halcyon early post-war years when the United States had yet to taste defeat in a polarized and politicized United Nations.

Thus, while Resolution 3379 went into the textbooks and popular consciousness in much of the world, it was, for the most part, ignored in the two nations, the United States and Israel, that had argued against it with the greatest fervor in 1975.

That does not mean that the resolution was forgotten. Important scholarship by Bernard Lewis and Charles Fairbanks quickly identified the resolution as part of a well-organized Soviet effort to delegitimize the State of Israel by discrediting and defaming the Zionist movement and the Jewish religion.

We could even trace this campaign to a clearly discernible formal beginning. On February 18 and 19, 1971, a two-part article appeared in *Pravda*, and was promptly published as an English language pamphlet, by Novosti press agency of Moscow, titled "Anti-Sovietism -- Profession of Zionists." It was soon to appear in six other languages and to be distributed around the globe. The 34-year-old author of the article was Vladimir Viktorovich Bolshakov, then (or shortly thereafter) deputy secretary of *Pravda's* editorial board in charge of the newspaper's international department -- and now, I may report to you today, *Pravda's* chief correspondent in Paris.

He asserted in the official newspaper of the Communist party of the Soviet Union that Jews, far from being victims of the Nazis, had been their collaborators. He wrote that "Zionist agents active during the last war in western and eastern Europe and in the occupied part of the Soviet Union collaborated with the Nazis. Many cases are known where Gestapo men recruited overseers in death camps and special 'police' from among Zionists who 'kept order' in Jewish ghettos. The tragedy of Babi Yar, wrote a number of Soviet citizens of Jewish origin who live in the Ukraine, in a letter to *Pravda*, 'will forever be a reminder not only of the monstrous barbarity of the Nazis but also of the indelible disgrace of their accomplices and followers -- the Zionists.'" An incredible lie, and a lie that for the most part went unanswered as it spread its poison to sections of the world that had little knowledge of the Holocaust or the Nazis but understood all too well the cardinal sin of racism.

During the first years after 1975 there was no systematic effort to focus on this resolution, its origins, and impact until the spring of 1983 when that great Irishman, Chaim Herzog, was elected president of Israel. Chaim Herzog had been Israel's ambassador to the United Nations during the 1975 debate. He understood the terrible impact of this resolution and he organized, in the fall of the 1984, the first formal symposium devoted to analyzing Resolution 3379. And it was Chaim Herzog who soon afterward first dared to suggest that the changing international situation might present an opportunity to marshal international support for the repeal of Resolution 3379.

In October 1987 I called President Herzog to discuss his forthcoming state visit to the United States. He told me about his visit the previous year to Australia and how, in conjunction with his visit, that nation's parliament had passed a plainly worded resolution that found that:

1. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379 (XXX), which equates Zionism with racism --
  - A) has been unhelpful in the context of the search for a settlement in the Middle East;
  - B) is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations;
  - C) remains unacceptable as a misrepresentation of Zionism;
  - D) has served to escalate religious animosity and incite anti-Semitism; and
2. recommends that the Australian government should lend support to efforts to overturn Resolution 3379 (XXX) in the United Nations.

It struck me that our Congress might do well to adopt this reasonable Australian resolution rather than craft a text of our own. When Chaim Herzog visited Washington in November 1987 both houses of Congress accordingly passed the Australian resolution and we asked the State Department to transmit our text to all American embassies and to urge our allies, and particularly our fellow democracies, to pass a similar resolution.

I can report today that the parliaments of Argentina, Belgium, Peru, the Netherlands, and Uruguay have passed this or a similar resolution to date, as has the European Parliament.

On March 30 of this year, I held a hearing entitled "Revoking the U.N. Zionism Resolution." At that hearing the State Department revealed that the "Soviets have assured us that the resolution represents a concept that is no longer acceptable according to the new political thinking of the Soviet Union."

On August 10 of this year, I received a letter from Judge Jerome Hornblass on behalf of the American Section of the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists. Judge Hornblass reports that the acting Soviet ambassador to the United Nations told a delegation from his organization that the Soviet Union is in favor of repudiating the statement that "Zionism equals racism."

Commenting on these developments recently I noted that "What immoral regimes create, moral regimes instantly repudiate. That is what President Havel of Czechoslovakia did when he came to power. He went to Jerusalem and publicly announced that he was reversing his nation's position on this issue. Let the Soviet Union do the same. Then, and only then, will it have the credibility which is essential to play a positive role in the search for peace."

The signs for such a change in Soviet policy have never been more hopeful. There is a new mood in the Soviet Union. Jews are being permitted to emigrate to Israel at a pace that sets a new record each month. Yeshivahs and synagogues are opening where they were long banned. The Soviets have sent a Pamyat leader to jail for anti-Semitism after a trial where he ironically -- and I might add quite logically -- cited Soviet support for Resolution 3379 in his defense!

And in the United Nations itself the change is felt. For a dozen years the Soviets led the annual challenge to Israel's General Assembly credentials. Last year they abstained. This year the Arab states, fearing actual Soviet opposition, are apparently dropping this effort in its entirety.

The presence this morning of the ambassadors to the United Nations of several Eastern European nations that once strongly supported Resolution 3379 dramatically confirms the degree to which this sorry resolution is an increasingly anachronistic residue of a long-discredited Cold War strategy.

And yet, even as the Soviet Union inches closer to joining our efforts, there is the troubling question of how strongly our government is committed to securing the repeal of Resolution 3379.

Last December, Vice President Quayle traveled to Yeshiva University's annual Hanukkah Dinner and made a strongly worded speech declaring that repealing the "Zionism is racism" resolution would "increase the moral authority of the United Nations" and allow it "to play a more constructive role in the Middle East."

A month later, I visited Israel and met with President Herzog. He shared my sense that the time was fast approaching when we could envision a successful effort to repeal Resolution 3379.

Yet we now read that the Administration "is postponing plans to seek repeal of a United Nations resolution equating Zionism with racism at this year's General Assembly so as not to imperil Arab support for trade sanctions against Iraq and for America's military build up in the Persian Gulf."

When Resolution 3379 was being considered fifteen years ago most Americans were not aware of the implications of this Soviet-inspired assault on the legitimacy of the only democracy in the Middle East. One American who was aware and cared deeply was Hubert Humphrey. His body already badly weakened by the disease that would kill him, Senator Humphrey flew to New York on the night of the General Assembly vote and sat in the Assembly chamber, as I later described him, "unannounced, unabashed, outraged, bearing witness."

Few Americans cherished the idea of the United Nations as much as Hubert Humphrey did. Few Americans loved the Senate or this country -- or served either with such distinction -- as Hubert Humphrey did. It might be well for the architects of the decision to suspend the efforts to repeal the "Zionism is racism" resolution to ponder what Senator Humphrey said about Resolution 3379: "The continued efforts to repeal this resolution will tell us a lot about the United Nations, and even more about the United States."

For fifteen years, the United States has made it clear that opposition to Resolution 3379 was a central principle of American Middle East policy. The suggestion that our commitment to work for the immediate repudiation of this odious resolution should be tempered by extraneous events -- even events as serious as the situation in the Persian Gulf -- is unacceptable. To the contrary, as the United Nations begins to function for the first time as the authors of the Charter envisioned, Resolution 3379 becomes ever more an anachronism which *must* be repealed.

With the ending of the Cold War, the United Nations faces a historic opportunity to become an effective tool for international change and international law. Yet as long as Resolution 3379 stains the honor and credibility of the United Nations its very effectiveness is severely compromised. By attempting to delegitimize one of its own member states the United Nations subjects itself to ridicule in the eyes of many Americans while virtually excluding itself from any role in the Arab-Israeli peace process.

As Anthony Lewis noted recently in the *New York Times*, ". . .the resolution has done no good for its sponsors either. Theirs was a Pyrrhic victory, and it is time they recognized it. The resolution has harmed the cause of justice and peace in the Middle East, and it will keep on doing harm until it is rescinded."

For the sake of this institution's great promise, we must work for the prompt rescinding of this insulting resolution.

Remarks of  
THE REVEREND JOSEPH A. O'HARE, S.J.  
President, Fordham University

I will speak very briefly, simply to recall that at the time of the passage of 3379 in 1975, the resolution was denounced immediately and universally by religious leaders around the world, and here in this country by, among other groups, the leadership of the National Catholic Bishops Conference. Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, archbishop of Chicago, who was at that time the president of the Catholic Bishops Conference, stated that the resolution was a terrible mistake, that it retards the necessary struggle against racism in the world, and opens the door to harassment, discrimination, and denial of basic rights to members of the Jewish community throughout the world.

There may be some mystery in terms of political tactics in reversing this resolution, and there may be, as Senator Moynihan alluded, a strange kind of poisonous presence that perhaps inhibits us in these matters. But I think it's very clear why religious leaders, in particular, should find this resolution such an obscene offense. We all recognize that religious passion can sometimes be a double-edged sword, that while the flame of religious passion can sometimes -- should, of course -- enlighten and inspire, sometimes it can be destructive and vicious. Therefore, the use of language is terribly important. The corruption of language leads to the corruption of the human spirit. To speak of Zionism as a form of racism is a profound corruption of language. This is why I think religious leaders, in particular, who are sensitive to the corruption of religious passion and religious faith, should be so exercised over the corruption of language embodied in this infamous resolution.

I think that as we look at the world today we see a very different world than that of 1975. We see a new moment, a new chance for the United Nations to answer the aspirations that so many around the world have for this institution, that it be a moral voice and a moral force. It seems to me that the first step, an important step, in living up to its own aspirations, in realizing the kind of moral credibility it must have if it is to exercise moral authority in the world, is for the United Nations to face this slander on its record and repeal this resolution. Until it does, it seems to me that the moral authority of what should be -- and is potentially -- a great savior of mankind and a great instrument of peace throughout the world, is compromised, and to that extent, the hopes for peace through this institution -- as well as its own moral credibility and moral authority -- are undermined, until this resolution is revoked.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR EDUARD KUKAN  
Permanent Representative to the United  
Nations from the Czech and Slovak  
Federative Republic

I took up my post six months ago, and since then this is my second friendly encounter with the American Jewish Committee. The first one was earlier this year when I had the honor to receive, on behalf of President Havel, the award which you gave to him, the American Liberties Medallion. So this is an honor for me. I thank you very much for this invitation to participate in your conference. I think it's an honor for Czechoslovakia to be represented here.

Czechoslovakia has become, after last year's November revolution, a completely different country. Czechoslovakia is building a new society, a multi-party society, multi-based economy, and so on. We are in a transition period. Of course, a transition period like that, as you understand, is pregnant with all kinds of problems, difficulties, and troubles. Yet our people are willing to pay the price for freedom. Nothing is free in life, and we are looking forward with optimism.

There are many things which our government has to correct and mend in its internal life and in its foreign policy. One of them is the issue of our diplomatic relations with Israel. In February of this year, we re-established relations. When President Havel was speaking about it, he said that in doing so our country is following up on its earlier longstanding traditional friendship with Israel and Jewish people. I'm sure you will remember that these traditional friendships date back to the very first days of the existence of the State of Israel.

The past severing of diplomatic relations has always been regarded by our people as an unwise, shortsighted action. From now on, Czechoslovakia would like to have balanced relations with the Middle East states.

Today we are speaking of Resolution 3379, which is a black spot on the record of the United Nations. Again I would like to quote my president. As you all know, he is a very unorthodox man. He has a very new way of expressing things and ideas. He wrote a letter to the then secretary of the League of Arab States, and he mentioned this resolution in his letter, and he said, very simply, "Personally I cannot agree with the wording of the resolution, as what it says is not true." That's all. Of course, during his very successful and unforgettable visit to Israel earlier this year, Havel reiterated again in Jerusalem very loudly and in a very clear way that we are very much against this resolution, that this resolution should be repealed, and we are willing to help in that.

We are firmly convinced that the resolution is harming the Jews and others around the world, that it is an infamous document in the archives of the United Nations. Yet to do away with it, we have to choose the right way to do so. In that respect, we think it is very important to coordinate the activities of all who are of the same opinion. I believe that this also underlines the importance of the conference today. We are ready to bring our contribution, small as it may be, but each vote is important. The position of each country is very important, and we are going not only to vote or wait for it, but we are going to work actively, and we are ready to be of any help in that respect.



Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR HANS OTTO BRAUTIGAM  
Permanent Representative of Germany to  
the United Nations

Looking at the United Nations, the German position after unification has not essentially changed. We have made an important commitment from the very beginning of our membership in the United Nations, and it is against this background that we took a clear position on Resolution 3379 in 1975. It is totally unacceptable to us. It was totally unacceptable to us at that time, and it is totally unacceptable to us today.

I agree with what has been said before by Ambassador Pickering and by Senator Moynihan, that it is not good enough to say there is no debate about it and that people don't pay attention, people don't even remember. This is not good enough. We believe that it is a question of fundamental principle for the United Nations that this should be repealed, it has to be eliminated. If the United Nations does not have the courage to say this is wrong and it has to go, then people will feel that there is not only a double standard in the United Nations, but that there are many standards in the United Nations, whatever is convenient. I think it is very, very important. This is not just a pragmatic matter, but one of principle.

For that reason, it is important that we take a position, that we keep up the debate. But we must, of course, carefully consider when and how and where to take an initiative. Just a majority is not good enough. Even a comfortable majority may not be wholly satisfactory. There has to be a very clear position taken by the vast majority of the organization.

I personally believe that there will be a majority to repeal if we work on it. And my government is committed to participate in working for repeal. The problem is not so much what the majority of member states believe on this subject, but that the debate would be used to discuss other problems, related and unrelated, and that there will be a discussion of Israeli policy in general. This has to be looked at very, very carefully. I don't think we have to be afraid of such a debate, but this is where tactics come in, and I think it has to be discussed among those who are experienced in the United Nations and who have the position and influence to speak to member states on this subject.

It is not good enough to say we are against it. It is not good enough to say why we are against it. It is very important to make clear that this is a problem of fundamental principles which cannot be mixed up with a lot of other problems which other countries may wish to bring in.

Remarks of  
THE VERY REVEREND LEONID KISHKOVSKY,  
President, National Council of the  
Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

The response of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America to the 1975 United Nations General Assembly resolution defining Zionism as a form of racism was made fifteen years ago by the general secretary of the NCC, Claire Randall. In her statement she spoke against the resolution, cautioning that "the resolution has the potential for reviving an old form of racism, anti-Semitism, in many places of the world." Another representative voice in the ecumenical Christian community, that of Philip Potter, then general secretary of the World Council of Churches, also spoke against the resolution, urging the United Nations to reconsider and rescind its action.

Today as we approach the fifteenth anniversary of the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, we are in the midst of a dangerous Middle East confrontation. As a result of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, powerful military forces are poised in the region. The threat of escalation brings with it the threat of nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare. There has been violence in Jerusalem as Israeli police confronted Arab Muslim demonstrators on the Temple Mount. There has been violence in New York as an Arab assassin killed Rabbi Kahane, leader of a extremist party among Israeli Jews.

Today we are witnessing enormous changes in Central and Eastern Europe. The collapse of communism, both as a system of power and totalitarian control and as an ideology, is paralleled by the renewal of legitimate national and religious aspirations in Central and Eastern Europe. This renewal is occurring in the context of a renewal of Christian values accompanied by the desire for a strong civil society and democracy.

In the midst of the triumph of the human spirit against totalitarianism, in the midst of the hope which change in Central and Eastern Europe brings to us, there is also a lurking danger. Authentic and humane national aspirations are sometimes paralleled by national and ethnic extremism, an extremism which has already resulted in some places in interethnic violence. We see in this situation the danger signals of anti-Semitism, an anti-Semitism which, among other things, is encouraging a massive emigration of Soviet Jews.

The United Nations today promises to be an authentic arena for international consensus in the pursuit of peace and justice. The actions taken by the U.N. in the current Middle East crisis demonstrate this. If the United Nations is to act creatively and fairly and helpfully in the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation which is part of the larger Israeli-Arab conflict, it will need to reconsider General Assembly Resolution 3379.

Finally, I pray that the international community, as well as the religious communities in this nation, in the Middle East, and around the world may contribute to peace and security for Israel, as well as to peace and human dignity for the Palestinian Arabs. The reconsideration and repeal of U.N. General Assembly Resolution 3379 will be a significant step toward the achievement of these goals.

Remarks of  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES SCHEUER (D-N.Y.)

On November 10, 1975, the United Nations undermined its ability and its credibility to serve as a catalyst for the nations of the world in solving the longstanding and bitter conflict in the Middle East. The credibility of the U.N. was brought under a cloud and remains there till now. On that day, my friends, by embracing that infamous language, the U.N. gave legitimacy to anti-Semitism, made anti-Semitism itself acceptable. And on that day the U.N. codified into international law that the State of Israel, in effect, is a racist state. On that day the U.N. denied self-determination to Jews and the State of Israel. The U.N. denied on that day the national expression of Israel's juridical and legal identity. On that day the United Nations denied legitimacy to Israel among the peoples of the world.

The irony of the situation is that it was the United Nations that helped in the creation of this great state. On May 14, 1948, partition was declared by the U.N. And two states were declared: one, the state of Israel, accepted partition and declared independence; the other, the Palestinian state, rejected the resolution, and along with all of its Arab neighbors, attacked the other state. When the dust had cleared, Israel had survived and the Arab nations had swallowed the Palestinian state alive with hardly a burp.

George Santayana said that those who do not learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them. We must not ignore the clear meaning of words. When words are pronounced ostensibly delegitimizing the State of Israel, we have to think about it, and it's not enough to brush off the United Nations as inconsequential and their words as inconsequential. As Moynihan said, these have been poisonous words throughout the last decade and a half, and they have had an impression. They have had an impact. They have had poisonous results. That's why it's important for us to do this job. These despicable words legitimize anti-Semitism. Make no bones about it: anti-Zionism *is* anti-Semitism. None other than Martin Luther King told us, "When people criticize Zionists, they mean Jews." Now, we all know that in our heart of hearts. The net result is codified anti-Semitism and anti-Israel hatred, and acceptability and legitimization of these hatreds.

These words have fostered hate and intolerance, legitimized anti-Semitic violence, and even justified war. They have fostered a pernicious double standard in the world community, evident in the continuous, systematic, one-sided condemnation of Israel for its valiant efforts to survive. But when Syria swallowed Lebanon, massacring at least 750 people in the process, the U.N. was silent. When Sadaam Hussein gassed 10,000 Kurds, his own citizens, citizens of the state of Iraq, the U.N. was silent. When hundreds were slain recently in Mecca, the U.N. was silent. When sixteen Israelis were killed in a bus attack, the U.N. was silent, strangely silent. When Israelis last year were murdered in a bus in Israel, the U.N. was silent. When tens of thousands of Arabs attacked unarmed worshipers in the holiest place in the State of Israel, the U.N. was silent. But when Israel tries desperately to protect her people at her holy places, suddenly the U.N. springs into action. This hypocrisy is a replay, a pernicious replay fifteen years later, of Resolution 3379. Words have consequences, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan said it before I said it.

Because of this resolution the U.N. has marginalized itself in the minds of many, making itself virtually irrelevant to the solution of the conflict in the Middle East. How can Israel possibly trust its survival to a body that challenges Israel's basic *raison d'être*? It challenges Israel as being racist and illegitimate. But it's not enough to say that. At a time when the U.N. is assuming an increasingly important role, it's vital that the lies the U.N. put forward in that ancient era when the Russians and their satellite

states, the Warsaw Pact states, African states, all supported them, it's important that those lies be obliterated from the record.

Thanks to this vast sea change in what's going on in the world, the Soviet Union itself, the various states in the Soviet Union, the various republics, the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, and even the countries of Africa, are doing an about-face. As Daniel Patrick Moynihan said, they know they bet on the wrong horse, and they're swiftly trying to write a new page for themselves. Just recently, eight countries of Africa have resumed diplomatic relations with the State of Israel. That's important. Maybe we can count on them to join in this effort at revalidating the legitimacy, not of Israel, but of the U.N. itself. And virtually all of the Eastern and Central European countries are doing an agonizing reappraisal of their conduct in the last thirty or forty years, giving training and ammunition, intelligence, to Arab terrorists. They're not doing that anymore. The Soviet Union isn't doing that anymore.

All that has to be done is a concerted, well-organized push in the chancelleries of the world to reverse this odious, atrocious statement of fifteen years ago.

The U.N. must redeem itself. Israel doesn't need legitimization; the U.N. needs legitimization. For all of us who believe in an elegant, thoughtful, decent international voice, the U.N. is our last best chance, and we'd better shape it up, brush it up, dust it off, and prepare it to do the marvelous job that it can do in the months and years ahead.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR YORAM ARIDOR  
Permanent Representative of Israel to the  
United Nations

If we have learned anything in the 20th century, which sometimes I doubt, it is that words are as potent as any weapons of destruction. To quote one of our greatest authors, Amos Oz, "Generations before the birth of Hitler, mass murderers always knew that you must first corrupt the words before you can corrupt those who use these words so that they may be capable of murder in the guise of purification. We must treat words like hand grenades."

But it was only in the 20th century, as technology advanced, with the eradication of all moral limitations on the exercise of power, that the ability to enslave men by imposing a monopoly on thought and abolishing the quality of objective reality grew to terrifying levels. In setting out the principles that were to evolve into a system of absolute control, Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* that "the great masses of people will more easily fall victim to a big lie than to a small one." And under Nazi totalitarianism and other regimes, words became the ultimate tool of indoctrination.

George Orwell observed that in such systems reality is not external; reality exists in the human mind, nowhere else. Whatever the party holds to be true, is true. The power to control truth, to control the minds of millions of human beings, unleashed the darkest era in the history of man, in which the Jewish people were targeted for systematic extermination. The mobilization of millions of participants in identifying, isolating, neutralizing, and eventually exterminating 6 million Jews would not have been possible without the creation of a system of thought sanctioning genocide. The concoction of odious labels, racial doctrines, historical theories, and so-called scientific facts dehumanized the Jews and sanctioned the necessity to destroy the element "poisoning the Aryan race."

Since then, the greatest victory in the manipulation of the human mind was achieved not in Berlin, but in New York. On November 10, 1975, a date loaded with historical significance for the Jewish people, the night of the *Kristallnacht*, the first signpost on the road to the final solution, the United Nations General Assembly conferred its legitimacy upon the goal of the destruction of the Jewish state. Racism, being defined in the parlance of the United Nations as an abomination to be abolished, included Zionism, which, once branded as such, was to be erased from the face of the earth. While Hitler met his death in Berlin, his spirit registered its appearance in the glass tower on First Avenue. Like *Kristallnacht*, Resolution 3379 was far from being an isolated incident. It was only the beginning of an insidious profanity that was to be repeated over and over again, entrenched and institutionalized. It became an axiom of the United Nations, permeating its very structure and seeping across the globe.

On December 14, 1979, four years later, the evil spirit reappeared again when the General Assembly condemned "hegemonism," a code word for imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism and apartheid. And then again in 1980, the program of action for the Decade of Women reaffirmed the necessity to -- and I quote -- "struggle to eliminate imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, Zionism, racism," and a long litany of other "isms." Outdoing even the Orwellian party slogan of "War is peace and freedom is slavery," the United Nations equated the attainment of peace with the elimination of Zionism. This abomination still stands in the records. Charging Zionism with racism was a monstrous perversion, singling out as its target the national liberation movement of the remnant of a people decimated by racism.

Such is the corrupting power of words.

Zionism really is the Jewish people's response to racism, the expression of its quest for equality, its answer to the intolerable suffering of centuries of persecution, ghettoization, pogroms, and extermination. But Zionism is also the essence of Judaism. Rooted in the rich heritage of Jewish moral thought, Zionism is the very antithesis of racism. It was from Jerusalem that the passion for justice, the idea that men are inherently born free and equal, was preached by the prophets. "God created man in His own image," that's the dictum of the Book of Genesis. "The same law shall be to him that is homeborn and unto the stranger that lives among you," the Book of Exodus. Engraved on America's Liberty Bell is the passage from the Book of Leviticus: "And you shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Just as Zionism cannot be severed from Judaism, anti-Zionism cannot be divorced from anti-Semitism. Just as anti-Semitism discriminates against the individual Jew, anti-Zionism slaps a yellow star on the collective breast of the Jewish people. I repeat the quotation by Martin Luther King, "When people criticize Zionists, they mean Jews."

The United Nations adopted the venomous terminology of the central document of the PLO, the Palestinian Covenant, which declares that its intent is the total repudiation of the existence of Israel. Zionism, according to the Covenant, must be eliminated, both because it is racist and because its evil deeds flow from its very essence. This is Article 22 of this infamous Covenant, and there are other articles as well. So what we understand from all this is that language enslaves thought, and then thought enslaves man.

Resolution 3379 will not have the last word. The terrible lie which defames Zionism and licenses anti-Semitism will evoke a powerful backlash worldwide. The unified reaction of the civilized world is clearly expressed in today's gathering. I have no doubt as to the success of our course. It might take a year, it might take longer, but undeniably the unvarnished truth will carry the day. The resurgence of democracy in many countries is dramatic testimony to the potency of truth. Truth, like freedom, will ring. And in the words of Martin Luther King, it will ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city. We will be able to speed up that day. Dr. King spoke about freedom. We speak about truth. The two are inextricably linked. This is the same struggle. Let freedom and truth go hand in hand. Let them both be victorious.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR SIR DAVID HANNAY  
Permanent Representative of the United  
Kingdom to the United Nations

The position of my government has been very clear from the outset. We believed -- and we made clear in the debates that led up to the adoption of this resolution -- that it was pernicious. We voted against it and we deplore the fact that we were in a minority in so doing. We are determined to work with other governments, including that of the United States, for the removal of this resolution from the annals of the United Nations.

Our analysis is that in recent years more and more countries have come to realize that it was a fundamental error to have ever been drawn down this road, and that in reality, this resolution is moribund. But, of course, that isn't enough. Our objective, like that of the United States, is to see it reversed. The key thing is to make sure that when steps are taken to remove this resolution, they are successful. Nothing would be more damaging or more unhelpful than if there were a failed attempt to do so. So the important thing is to choose the time when the support is there to achieve the objective, and then to do it once and for all. That is the objective of my government. It's what we'll all be working for in the period ahead. The shorter that period can be, the better, because, as I say, this is a pernicious resolution. But the important thing is to make sure that when it goes, it goes for good.

I don't wish to speculate about how long it will take to achieve this result, because such speculation, particularly in this city, tends to widen the mark and to be unhelpful to the objective which we're all pursuing. But the important thing is to keep that objective in our sights and to pursue it in a determined and systematic way, and that is what my government will be doing.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR ANDRÉ ERDOS  
Permanent Representative of Hungary to  
the United Nations

I'm very happy to be here with you this afternoon at the invitation of the American Jewish Committee. I am particularly pleased to note that the prime minister of Hungary, during his recent official visit to the United States, had the opportunity to meet in New York with the representatives of the American Jewish Committee.

I am glad to be at this conference, which helps keep on our minds and on the political agenda of our times the infamous resolution 3379 of the United Nations equating Zionism with racism. On the one hand, it is painful for me to speak about this resolution, since Hungary was among those countries which voted in favor of it back in 1975. That seemed to many of us at that time a politically motivated position which ran counter to reason and facts. That act was one of those foreign policy undertakings which were clearly imposed upon Hungary and did not reflect the true sentiments of the Hungarian people, nor, for that matter, of those who were involved in carrying out this decision.

On the other hand, Hungary has been witnessing in the '80s a gradual yet steady opening in its foreign policy which made it possible, among many other things, to depart more and more radically from previously held doctrinaire and ideologically determined positions.

In the particular case that preoccupies us today, one has to note that already at the previous session of the General Assembly of the U.N. in 1989, Hungarian delegates expressed the view that the world body should reconsider Resolution 3379 of 1975.

Then in January of 1990, at the very last regular meeting devoted to United Nations affairs of a number of former socialist countries from various continents, a practice discontinued since, I had the opportunity as the head of the Hungarian delegation to that meeting to announce the intention of the Hungarian government to work for the elimination of Resolution 3379.

At this year's session of the General Assembly, the foreign minister of Hungary declared in unambiguous terms that the U.N. can help remove the factors impeding mutual understanding in the Middle East conflict and that one such factor, he said, was G.A. Resolution 3379 equating Zionism with racism. My minister declared in his speech to the General Assembly that this resolution was a product of the bygone age of confrontation, a document reflecting the ideological shackles of the past. My minister said that the government of the Republic of Hungary disassociates itself from the resolution.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are convinced that this resolution must be buried in the graveyard of the Cold War of hatred and intolerance which caused so much suffering to the peoples of this planet. However, this interment must be carried out in such a manner that the funeral should be genuinely fatal, and that the cadaver could never resurrect. This requires careful preparation, intensive multilateral dialogue with the members of the international community, a well thought-out procedure, an acute sense of timing, and a clear awareness of what we want and what we do not want.

Standing before you as the representative of Hungary, I can't help thinking about certain political



and moral lessons to be drawn from contemporary European and Hungarian history. Every European -- every Hungarian, indeed -- must know that what happened to the Jewish people is an unparalleled outrage of history. This summer I was there at the dedication ceremony of the memorial to the Hungarian Jewish martyrs in the center of Budapest, in the garden of one of the most beautiful and grandiose synagogues in the world. I listened with the crowd in the garden and in the neighboring streets to the address delivered by Prime Minister Antal of Hungary. I stood there, carried away by the sounds of both the Hungarian and Israeli national anthems, by reminiscences of a gloomy past and the promise of a brighter future.

At this memorial, which is in the form of a weeping willow tree whose leaves have thousands and thousands of names, victims of the Holocaust, engraved on them, the prime minister said that this monument represented the tragedy shared by all in Hungary. He declared that he wanted everyone to know that the Hungarian government that came to assume, in these troubled times, the task of leading this land, felt a sense of responsibility for the Jewish community living in Hungary. He added that he hoped there would never be a need to protect this community, but that "We will defend the Jewish community in the face of any threats, any ideas that might cause a repetition of the past."

There are events and facts to be proud of as far as Hungary's record in this respect is concerned. Hungary was turned into a haven for hundreds of thousands of Jews who fled pogroms in other countries in the second half of the 19th century. Our land became a place where before World War I nearly 1 million Jews lived and where the Jewish faith was the second largest religion in Budapest after the Roman Catholic. Let us also remember that amid the horrors and terrible tragedies of World War II, it was here in Hungary that, despite all the discrimination and persecution, the largest Jewish community was able to stay in place until March of 1944, when the Nazis occupied Hungary.

Let us recall, likewise, the tremendous contribution Hungarians of Jewish origin made to the political, economic, social, and cultural development of our nation. Let us emphasize the role of Hungary in providing, after the last world conflagration, opportunities for Jewish religious life and education. Let us also remember that Hungary was the very first nation in Central or Eastern Europe to re-establish diplomatic relations with Israel. Let us point out the genuine revival of Jewish culture and identity under the new democratic conditions of my country.

When we Hungarians think or speak about U.N. Resolution 3379, we bear in mind the past of our country, which plunges us into deep mourning, the apocalypse of the *Endlosung*, and the demented terror instituted by the Hungarian Arrow Cross movement. There is no excuse for those who were guilty. Jewish martyrdom will shine in the skies as long as there is human civilization.

Just the other day I attended here in New York a solemn memorial service on the 45th anniversary of the Hungarian Jewish catastrophe. My participation at this service, not only as a human being, but in my official capacity, was a message that we think of the martyrs as of our own, because they are our own.

The memory of those who were brutally torn away from the body of the nation will accompany us for generations to come, and it is this moral debt that imposes on us, on Hungarian foreign policy, the pursuit of a definite and clear-cut course of action. It is this commitment to the ideas of justice, tolerance, and human togetherness that made my prime minister say at the dedication ceremony of the memorial to the Hungarian Jewish martyrs that "Whoever of the Jewish community in Hungary feels that he wishes to live abroad in Israel may be certain that this government will never put an obstacle in his way. And those who think that they want to be Jews here, to be Jews first of all in Hungary, can also be assured of this right and freedom with all the legal protection in our power. Whereas those who feel that they want to live here above all as Hungarians, whether as believers or non-believers, should be able to live here in full freedom and enjoying all the rights and the recognition of society in tranquillity and without worry about their peace of mind."

Ladies and gentlemen, our country has completed a very important transition from one-party rule to parliamentary democracy, and is presently going through a delicate process of passage from an amoral state-run economy to a social market economy. These are times of great transformations and turbulences in which the most formidable challenge we face is to change human mentality. In this historic endeavor of renewal, in such crucial times of economic difficulties and strains of various kinds, we also witness the resurgence of intolerant attitudes, extreme behaviors, chauvinistic, nationalist attitudes and views, theories of exclusiveness, and anti-minority behavior -- among them, anti-Semitism. The legacy of 600,000 Hungarian Jewish victims of the Holocaust makes this particularly grave.

Today, after years of gradual opening and rebirth of genuine democracy in Hungary, it is time to push aside taboos, apprehensions, and misconstrued prudence. It is time to speak out on these issues and accept this legacy and its consequences. The Hungarian parliament and the government solemnly paid tribute last year to the memory of all those Hungarians of Jewish origin or faith who perished. At the same time, prejudice, intellectual intoxication, mental poison, cannot be extirpated as a result of a simple parliamentary decree or a governmental decision. Nor should the negative phenomena brought to the surface by democratic change and economic problems in Hungary be underestimated, but they are -- and will remain -- peripheral manifestations. The government and the political parties in Hungary, all the responsible forces of society, are unanimous in the resolve to keep it that way and not to allow these despicable tendencies to gain ground and to take us back to the darkest days of our national history.

We must wage a continued fight against them. What is really needed is full-scale activity in education, information, and culture, firm and purposeful legislative action and, if need be, in law enforcement. A state that tolerates or, worse, encourages prejudice is no democracy. A state's democracy can be measured by its attitude toward those who are, in one way or another, different, who are a minority. Just as we in Hungary are not indifferent to the fate of those Hungarians who live beyond our borders, it is incumbent on us to show sensitivity toward any other ethnic or religious minority, including those in Hungary, and among them Hungarian Jewry.

As proclaimed in the recent statement by the Hungarian government issued on the eve of Hungary's formal entry in the Council of Europe and the 40th anniversary of the Council Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Hungarian government regards the national, ethnic, religious, and other minorities living on the territory of our state as factors enriching our social, spiritual, and cultural life, and not as ones curtailing the rights and scope of activities of the majority. We strongly believe that a minority should enjoy all its rights in its native land where their ancestors have lived for centuries. They should have full opportunity to consciously assume their own specific identity just as they should have the right to identify themselves with the people whose destiny, culture, language, religion, and intellect they wish to share. It is only under these conditions that proclaiming the right to leave the country remains an act of credibility and not of hypocrisy.

Concluding, and thanking you and the American Jewish Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak, I wish to appeal to all of us to do our utmost everywhere -- in Europe and all the corners of the globe, including the Middle East, the most protracted and complex crisis area that our contemporary world has ever known -- to help create conditions susceptible to breaking the horrible cycle of violence, to overcome prejudice, to promote understanding and mutual knowledge among peoples, and also by wishing you success in your noble activities and in this delicate endeavor aimed at cleansing the United Nations of a document which does wrong to all mankind, irrespective of race, color, language, religious affiliation, or nationality. I believe that together we can achieve our objectives.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR STANISLAW PAWLAK  
Permanent Representative of Poland to  
the United Nations

I owe to you two remarks at the beginning. There is no nation in Europe that is so tightly connected with the Jewish nation as the Polish nation is. For the last thousand years, Jews who were not welcome in some Western countries found their fatherland in Poland. We suffered together, we lived together, our cultures mixed together, and we still have a lot in common. The great tragedy which we lived through during the Second World War we share with Jewish communities. Three million Jewish people who lived in Poland perished because of German policies. Three million Poles perished because of German policies. There is no measurement of blood; there is no value placed on suffering. But this is our suffering. We have to remember that.

After the war, Poland became a satellite country. Our sovereignty was limited, and because of that, the infamous Resolution 3379 was supported by the former government of Poland. Because of that, in spite of every political, legal, and moral principle, that resolution got support.

Poland now is in the middle of great, important, fundamental changes. We started those changes ten years ago, accelerated them last year, and we have a new government. This new government has, since its formation in September last year, started to reshape our foreign policy, making foreign policy adequate to our sovereign rights and our sovereign interests, and that policy includes repealing Resolution 3379. This infamous resolution, which has no place in the annals of the United Nations, should never have been adopted. I share the view that words have meaning, as said by the senator and former U.S. representative whom I remember speaking against that resolution so eloquently and so strongly.

Now we have to think about how to repeal this resolution, what to do. My prime minister, in March of this year, very strongly stated that we'll repeal the resolution and we'll do everything possible and necessary to do it.

We have been in contact with the American government and with other governments, to look for the best way to have this resolution erased from the annals of the United Nations. We hope that those contacts will bring some fruits. We have been in contact with the Israeli government, with whom we have established diplomatic relations, with whom we have very close cooperation in many areas, to find out the best possible way to go together, to find the working majority, not only in numbers, but in moral strength and political values. I think this conference today gives us a lot of new ideas, a lot of new thoughts. We have to work together and try to get as many friends as possible from all over the world, who will really understand that that product of the Cold War period of confrontation is no longer valid. It is not a question of Israel. It is a question of working together to repeal this type of resolution from the annals of the United Nations and use that organization not for condemning people, but for working together to make life better.

Remarks of  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE BILL GREEN (R-N.Y.)

The United Nations is a place of different images. One, which we have recently seen, is of a body where representatives from around the world come together to achieve a common agenda of world security and peace, a place where diplomats can hold rational discourse on the range of worldwide concerns, such as how to contain a Saddam Hussein, down to the shape of the table or what the agenda ought to be.

But there is, of course, another image of the United Nations, and unfortunately that one has some reality, too. It's a much less pleasant image -- at best, the last large insane asylum in the United States; at worst, a place that's positively malicious. I could go on about diplomats living high on the hog in New York while their people are starving back home in their countries. That's another image of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the United Nations sometimes reflects that reality, too, and nowhere has it reflected that reality more than in the passage of Resolution 3379.

Today the United Nations is at something of a crossroads. Obviously when the founding fathers of the United Nations, back in 1945, put the organization together, they did not anticipate the Cold War, and the organization was obviously designed to function best in a world where the largest powers were at peace with each other and able to cooperate with each other. As a result of the extraordinary events in Eastern Europe over the last couple of years, we are now approaching that state of the world, and we have seen how the United States and the Soviet Union can cooperate in the United Nations, although through most of the years of its history, they did not cooperate. So that possibility lies ahead for the United Nations.

But at the same time, if the United Nations is to have the credibility to be able to carry off that role in the world, then the United Nations must rid itself of those other tendencies which, as I say, have been too much a part of its history. So whether the United Nations is prepared to repeal Resolution 3379 will be very much a test of which path the United Nations will follow. If the nations of the world, all of the nations, the small ones as well as the big ones, are serious about the United Nations, serious about the institution as a vehicle for achieving collective security in this world, then we will see 3379 repealed. If they're not serious, if they really want to play the same old games and wish to see the U.N. shrivel away as any sort of important institution in the world, whatever its real estate may be valued at, then they will keep 3379 and we will know that there will have to be other vehicles through which the world will achieve collective security. The choice is really that of the nations of the U.N. I hope they decide wisely.

Remarks of  
AMBASSADOR VIERI TRAXLER  
Permanent Representative of Italy to the  
United Nations

In 1975 Italy voted against this particular resolution. It has been our policy to try throughout the years at the United Nations to overcome the ideological differences which paralyzed the United Nations and forced it to adopt resolutions that were, at worst, an insult, like this particular one -- at best, irrelevant, because of the number of contradictions they contain.

I quite agree that the United Nations has to try to live up to the changes that have taken place in the world in order to become more relevant and possibly a real instrument for the maintenance of peace and security. When we talk of changes that have occurred in the rest of the world, we refer essentially to the changes that occurred in Europe. I was lucky enough to be in Vienna for three years with my friend André Erdos, who was representing Hungary, at the Vienna meeting of the CSC. It was perhaps the most interesting experience of my whole diplomatic career, where we saw in three years of very hard work the positions of the Eastern European countries -- in particular the Soviet Union -- gradually evolve and change. Of course, the changes that took place in Europe were not created by our conference, but our work anticipated them and in many ways legitimized them. No one of us could foresee the speed at which this situation would evolve, but certainly for the governments that were there, it became more and more difficult -- almost impossible -- to refuse to their own people what they had accepted in Vienna in January 1989 in the concluding document of the Vienna meeting.

In that meeting, my delegation had one role. Among the sixteen Western delegations, we had a division of labor dealing with different subjects. Each one of us was appointed as a leader to pursue one particular objective, and the Italian delegation, together with the delegation of Norway, were the leaders of the group dealing with religious freedom and religious education. I just want to quote to you a small example of our work, because I think it signifies the weight that words can carry and also the interest of my government in that specific problem.

We worked very hard to influence the Eastern European delegations, particularly the Soviet delegation, because others like Hungary or Poland were essentially on our side from the beginning. Whatever their governments were thinking, their delegates were really cooperating. But there were tougher nuts to crack. We insisted on a text which would recognize the right of every individual to give and receive religious education individually or in groups. This was a big step forward, because in a communist country, education is a function of the state. Anyone who gathers three kids to teach them multiplication is committing a crime because it's a function that pertains to the state. If he gets together three kids to teach them religion, then it's a double crime. So to get these countries to adopt the text that I just quoted was already a great success.

But the last six months were spent convincing, persuading, twisting the arm of the Soviets and others to add to those stipulations the words "in the language of his choice." That applied only to Judaism. It took us six months to get it through, but we did. And indeed, now the changes in the Soviet Union have been remarkable. But that was a significant victory that was gained by the West in forcing, so to speak, the Soviets to accept not only that anybody, if he wanted, was free to teach religion, but that Jewish religion, which could have been discriminated against because it is taught in Hebrew, had to be made the object of

this special clause, to reinforce it. I take particular pride in this because it was an achievement of everybody, naturally, but my delegation took a leading role.

The great strength of the CSC process, something which I mention briefly because it is not sufficiently known in this country, is that we start from the so-called final act of Helsinki. It's called the final act because it is not a treaty; it is not a convention; it is not a protocol; it has never been ratified by any parliament. That is why it's not called a treaty, but just a final act. The engagements in the final act are purely political engagements; they are not rigid. But the final act contains one element of extreme novelty, unprecedented, I would say, in that it includes in the principles which govern the relation between states and the security of states the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This respect is placed among the other components of security.

In other words, for the first time a diplomatic instrument recognized that the respect for human rights and fundamental freedom is an essential element in conduct between states. Therefore, the signatories of that agreement in Helsinki undertook an obligation not only toward other countries, as is normal with any pact, but with their own citizens as well. This has enabled, through a long process, the Western countries to use this as leverage in dealing with what was then the Soviet bloc in obtaining, step by step, even greater freedoms or, rather, obtaining the respect for freedoms. Many of those countries, like Mr. Brezhnev, when he put his signature to that document, had not the slightest intention of respecting it. But it gave us a tool with which to tie any advance in the field of security, disarmament, military security, which is what the Soviets wanted, to bargain for greater observance of fundamental rights and fundamental freedom. This had its origin, as I say, in Vienna and it is continuing. The process is going on. We have a special instrument called the human dimension, which calls for a conference every year at which any country can call to order another country for not respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms.

This is the great difference between CSC and the U.N., because the U.N. is essentially an organization of states whose constitution is somewhat outdated because it emerged immediately after the war. The U.N. has passed a great many resolutions on human rights and fundamental freedom, the fundamental declaration on human rights, and so on, but these instruments are full of escape clauses such as "in principle," or "as a norm," or "subject to the special legislation," and so on, which practically deny what they accept in the first paragraph. This was done, in part because the acts passed by the U.N. acquire the status of treaties and have to be ratified by parliament, and partly because in those days it was impossible to get anything from the Soviets that did not contain these escape clauses.

The situation is now changing. I think that the evolution indicated by Congressman Green is becoming possible, just because of the precedents that have been set in Europe. So I think it is possible that even at the U.N. we may induce a majority -- I would hope a consensus, a totality -- of the states to repeal this particular resolution.

Why do I say "consensus"? Because I think that this resolution is not only repugnant for any thinking person; it is damaging to the United Nations. As such, it should be recognized by all member states as something that impinges on the vitality, the relevance, the effectiveness of the U.N. Repeal would be much more powerful if it were done by the totality of the members rather than just a majority of them.

Not introducing an instrument for the repeal of that resolution now, but continuing the pressure, allowing the situation to mature so that we can reach a repeal possibly by consensus, would be a great advantage. As I said before, we labored three years in Vienna to obtain certain results which would not have been obtainable in the first six months, in the first year, or in the second year, but they became obtainable.

I'd like to quote from the statement of my foreign minister last year, not in this General Assembly but the previous one, in a speech which was devoted essentially to the new role of the United Nations, for the need of the U.N. to become more relevant in establishing a more integrated order. He said, "The new world is not just around the corner, but if we want to start building it today, we must make the United

Nations the chief instrument of global integration. Particularly out of place in a world moving toward gradual integration are, in our opinion, such resolutions adopted in a different climate as the one equating Zionism with racism, which should be canceled." These are the words of my foreign minister. This is the policy of the Italian government.

Remarks of  
**RAUL YZAGUIRRE**  
President of the National Council of La Raza  
on behalf of the leaders of a coalition of  
civil rights and ethnic organizations

My name is Raul Yzaguirre. I'm president of the National Council of La Raza. I have the distinct honor and privilege to read to you a statement on behalf of the civil rights leadership of the United States of America. Before I read that statement to you -- ordinarily I hate reading, I'd rather speak to you from the heart -- I want to mention to you the names of the organizations that are co-signers to this agreement. They include the American Indian Law Alliance; the American Latvian Association; A. Philip Randolph Institute; Asian American Council; Black Jewish Coalition of Greater Philadelphia; Chicago Urban League; Chinese American Citizens Alliance; Church of God and Christ International Body; Commission for Social Justice, International Order of the Sons of Italy; Coretta Scott King; Human American National Council; Human American National Foundation; Hispanic Leadership Institute; Illinois Ethnic Consultation; Indo China Resource Action Center; Japanese American Citizens League; Filipino Institute; Lithuanian Council, Inc.; Lithuanian Community, Inc.; Lithuanian World League Center; Los Angeles Urban League; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials; National Council of La Raza; National Council of Negro Women; National Association for Bilingual Education; National Italian American Foundation; National Polish-American Jewish-American Council; National Puerto Rican Coalition; National Urban League; Order of the Sons of Italy in America; Organization of Chinese Americans; Philadelphia Urban Coalition; Polish American Congress; Polish American Congress, Illinois Division; Polish American Congress National Anti-Defamation Committee; Polish Falcons of America; Polish National Alliance; Polish Roman Catholic Union of America; Polish Women's Alliance of North America; Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; Ukrainian National Association; UNICO National; United Hellenic American Congress; World Federation of Free Latvians.

On behalf of these and, I'm sure, many other organizations who would have liked to sign this if they had an opportunity, I'm very proud and pleased to read to you the following statement.

"We are leaders of American ethnic and racial groups, dedicated to promoting pluralism and opposing bigotry. We represent America's historic commitment to freedom and justice. In short, we are America's United Nations.

"Today we join together to condemn, on the fifteenth anniversary of its passage, the infamous United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379 that equated Zionism with racism. This resolution is an insult to millions of Americans whose racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds make them especially sensitive to all forms of bigotry. It also has produced widespread anti-Semitism which all who value freedom and pluralism repudiate.

"For fifteen years U.N. Resolution 3379 has resulted in attacks on Jews on college campuses and charges that Jews, by definition, support racism. It has encouraged historical revisionists to claim legitimacy for their outrageous comparison between Israel and Nazi Germany. It has given comfort to extremists who want to see Israel destroyed and has hampered the search for peace for all peoples in the Middle East.

"The U.N. resolution abuses law to promote hatred. All who remember Jim Crow and Nuremberg



know the danger to everyone when bigotry is embodied in law. Resolution 3379 also demeans the concept of racism by subordinating it to narrow and illegitimate political purposes.

"We cannot remain silent in the face of this destructive resolution or allow its pernicious influence on human relations and the Jewish people to go unchallenged. We join with our government, as well as with an increasing number of nations all over the world, in urging the United Nations to mark this fifteenth anniversary by repealing Resolution 3379. Nothing less will uphold the standards of human dignity which all people of good will have an obligation to respect."

Remarks of  
JUDGE HADASSA BEN ITTO  
President, International Association of  
Jewish Lawyers and Jurists

I was Israel's delegate at the Third Committee in 1975 when Resolution 3379 was passed. I was there with Senator Moynihan, and I can share with him the feeling of somebody who saw this resolution being born. But I think I'm the only one in this room, including Senator Moynihan, who saw this resolution being conceived, and that was when I first came to the United Nations in 1965. It was not started in '75; it started in 1965. Because you have not heard that story, I thought that would be a good thing to tell you.

In 1965, I was a young judge. I've been on the bench for thirty years, so I was already a judge in 1965. Golda Meir, who was then secretary for foreign affairs in Israel, called me and said, "Do you want to go to the Third Committee of the United Nations Assembly?"

I said, "What is the Third Committee?" I had never heard of it.

So I was told how the United Nations Assembly works, and I was told that at this particular assembly the Third Committee would be discussing the convention against all forms of racial discrimination. It was Golda Meir who told me, "We are especially interested in this convention because of our past and because of the Holocaust, and I think I want a special delegate to be in the Third Committee and help draft this important document." And the reasons are obvious.

So I went, and I was very proud to go.

First of all, I learned in a very few days that we, in those days especially, were not like other delegations. We were second-class citizens in this United Nations. There were many signs. For instance, I was told that we should not strive to co-sponsor any resolutions, that we were not very well-accepted partners for sponsoring resolutions, that they had a better chance of passing without us co-sponsoring. It got to a point where UNICEF got the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1965, and it was an Israeli lady who was chairman of the board of UNICEF. She was going to Oslo to receive the Nobel Prize, and they started co-sponsoring a resolution that was making its rounds to say "bravo" to UNICEF. I was specifically asked not to co-sponsor that resolution because if Israel did, it probably would not pass. Would you believe it?

Now on to Zionism and racism. How did it start? How was it born? The first draft that came up to the Third Committee from ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council, defined "racism" and "racial discrimination." There was a definition in general words, but there were also some specific examples of racism and racial discrimination set out in that definition. Of course apartheid. Of course Nazism. Of course colonialism. And, of course, *not* anti-Semitism.

It was the United States delegation that suggested that "anti-Semitism" be added formally to the definition of "racism" in this document for the erasure of all forms of racial discrimination. Would you believe it? I didn't believe in the beginning that there would be anybody who, after the Holocaust, would say no to this amendment, but the fight that started in the corridors of this august building was unbelievable. There was a terrible fight not to add "anti-Semitism." As a matter of fact, you know, the United Nations has since condemned just about everything under the sun, but not anti-Semitism.

The fight started then. I couldn't believe it. Soviet Russia was behind it, together with the countries that had belonged to the Reich. It took me some time to understand that anti-Semitism was an official policy in Soviet Russia, and they had gotten used to being labeled anti-Semites. But "racism" was the big word then. To be called a racist was, with all the emerging Third World countries, to be called a murderer. So Russia did not relish the danger of being called racist. Anti-Semite was all right, but if anti-Semitism is racism, Russia might be called racist, and this they did not want.

So there was a big fight going on. Would you believe it? There were so many things happening in the world, but this fight took up so much time of the delegates that it was unbelievable. I felt like Alice in Wonderland.

Finally, because the United States would not give up, one morning we woke up and found on our tables a new draft amendment instigated by Soviet Russia, "add to this definition 'Zionism.'" We thought it was a bad joke, which it was. But it wasn't a joke at all; it was a tactical maneuver. That is how the resolution was born. It was a tactical maneuver in 1965 to throw out "anti-Semitism." If anybody has any doubts whether this is an anti-Semitic solution, history shall tell you the linkage to anti-Semitism.

So as a tactical maneuver, it succeeded, because the consensus of the United Nations was to throw out and delete both. So in 1965, Zionism was not labeled racism, but neither was anti-Semitism. I think it's important to recall that this happened in 1965, because later many people tried to link this to the territories Israel occupied in war. We still had diplomatic relations there with all the Third World countries and the Soviet bloc, and still they all fought against us and formed the majority not to include anti-Semitism, and there was a real danger of including Zionism.

But words, even those that are thrown out as a tactical maneuver and thrown out as a joke, gain a life of their own. It was in the air since '65. Of course, later when the Six Day War came, it was there. Suddenly then they threw up this trial balloon in '74 in Mexico, and then it came in 1975. It should not have come as a surprise, but it did. It just landed on us.

Just a few words to tell you the context in which it was presented, because the context was important. It was done deviously. It was not just a resolution that stands by itself; it was part of a much larger resolution. The United Nations in those days was going to pass a resolution to have a Decade Against Racism, and this was a very big thing because who can be against racism? They had a Decade for Women's Rights and now we're going to have a Decade Against Racism. Of course, if you have such a decade, you have seminars and you have textbooks and you have people going around the world talking about racism. There's a whole program for ten years, and of course it was voted in, mostly by people of the Third World and, of course, it's funded and financed by the West. That is exactly what was planned, with Western free-country financing, a whole Decade Against Racism. They would also be financing and legitimizing the fight against the Jews and the fight against Zionism. Because whenever a seminar is held in the context of the Decade Against Racism, it would also be a seminar against Zionism. It would also be a seminar for anti-Semitism.

There is not enough time to tell you what actually went on there. It's unbelievable. Everybody mentions the great address of Senator Moynihan in explanation of the vote of the United States. I want to mention something else. I want to mention the fact that it took great personal courage by Senator Moynihan -- then Ambassador Moynihan -- to stand up after the vote and walk all the way from where the United States delegation was sitting to where we were sitting, a full delegation, and embrace at that time Ambassador Herzog, now President Herzog. It took great personal courage because there was so much hatred in the air. We actually felt fear.

I'm reminded of the test set by the Supreme Court of the United States on First Amendment

matters, "a clear and present danger." There was clear and present danger at that time, actual hatred, actual fear in the air. That is why I'm telling you from eye-witness testimony that it took actual courage for Senator Moynihan to get up and walk in front of all the cheering crowds. They were actually cheering. They were dancing. You can't imagine the atmosphere. To go and just not say a word, but to embrace Ambassador Herzog, now President Herzog.

A lot was said here about the repercussions of this resolution. It is impossible to monitor into how many minds this poison seeps. We will never know how many children in the world studied from textbooks saying that Zionism is racism. We'll never know how many of these children are the future leaders of this world, the future legislators. We'll never know because this is something we cannot measure. But we can give a few examples. This resolution was used by anti-Semites around the world. It got into a dictionary defining racism in three forms: apartheid, Nazism, and Zionism. There were courses taught in universities that Zionism is racism, with the sanction of the United Nations. I learned from Natan Sharansky that in his trial in Soviet Russia the prosecutor got up and said, "May it please the court. There is nothing we have to prove against this man. He is an admitted Zionist. Zionism is racism according to the United Nations resolution. And, of course, racism is a criminal offense in Russia. So what do we have to prove? Nothing. He has admitted his crime."

It behooves us to remember that anti-Semitism throughout the ages has always rested on labels and on lies. We are not the only people in the world who are victims of racism, but I think that if there was a prize for a group of people about whom the most lies were told, I think we would take that prize. I, representing Israel in many international forums, I was called again and again -- not me, my people -- "Christ killers," "poisoners of wells," "perpetrators of ritual murder with blood," all these things. They don't replace each other, these lies; the list becomes longer all the time.

Then we go on, of course, to the famous, or infamous, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. This terrible book, which has been published in the world for almost 100 years, new editions of which are being published today in many languages around the world, this book, which was proclaimed by courts of law as far back as the '30s as a forgery and a plagiarism, is being published fifty years later as an authentic document. Many acts of violence against Jews are perpetrated in the name of the lies told in that terrible book.

There are a lot of ladies here, as I see. If you have something spilled on your dress, people will tell you, "Go to the cleaners very quickly, because if you let the stain sit there, it will never come out." And I'm telling you, if you let this stain sit there very long, it will not come out. It will poison the minds of people and it might be too late.

I am not a diplomat and I cannot tell you what tactics to use, not to use, or how to use them, or when to use them to erase this terrible stain, but I can tell you from my experience and from the experience of my people, from my gut feeling, that we don't have too much time. If we wait much longer, irreparable damage will have been done. So please don't wait. Do something, you diplomats!

Remarks of  
DIMITAR KOSTOV  
Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to  
the United Nations

The subject of this conference is the United Nations Resolution 3379 of the 10th of November 1975. The 10th of November is, by a strange coincidence, a very famous date in my country now, because on that day the totalitarian regime of Todor Zhivkov was brought down and Bulgaria started on the road to democracy. So I'm sorry, but we have different feelings about the tenth of November.

Bulgaria has come a long way over these past twelve months. Despite difficulties in the economic sphere currently experienced by my country and further exacerbated by the crisis in the Persian Gulf, Bulgaria is firmly committed to building a democracy and market economy. We have restored our national independence and sovereignty, and this has enabled us to reassess our foreign policy and its priorities. The main goal of this policy now is to defend our national interests on the basis of pragmatism and by taking into consideration the political realities in the world. As our president stated before the United Nations General Assembly a month ago, "Bulgaria is not a communist country anymore." An important result of the reorientation and deideologization of foreign policy was the establishment of diplomatic relations on the ambassadorial level with Israel. We trust that our relations with Israel will quickly gather momentum, especially in view of the historical roots and the friendship between Bulgaria and Jews. I hardly need to remind you of the historical fact that Bulgarian Jews were saved from being sent to concentration camps.

There is a re-examination of our position on some foreign policy subjects, including Resolution 3379 of November 10 equating Zionism with racism. I hope that my appearance here will speed up this re-examination. The old position in support of the resolution was adopted under the pressure of certain political circumstances of which you are well aware, as well as a result of ultimatums in holding the Soviet line and supporting the Arab line.

It is my personal view that this reassessment will lead to a complete rejection of the resolution as slanderous, false, an expression of anti-Semitic propaganda, and an obstacle to defining a comprehensive, just, and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict. The change will be announced soon, at the appropriate level, and it is not for me to do it now. But I hope it will be very soon. It is my view that it is necessary to repeal the resolution in order to create an atmosphere for all parties in the conflict to understand that history has destined them to share the same fate, that reconciliation and coexistence have no alternatives. We are prepared to join the efforts in revoking this resolution as a part of strengthening and cleansing the United Nations, and making it responsive to the expectations of peoples throughout the world.

# THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

## HEADQUARTERS

Institute of Human Relations  
165 E. 56th Street  
New York, NY 10022  
212 751-4000

GOVERNMENT AND  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20036

ISRAEL  
16 King George Street  
Jerusalem, Israel 91014  
22 88 62/23 35 51  
202 265-2000

## AREA OFFICES

---

### ATLANTA

One Securities Ctr. #1310  
3490 Piedmont Rd, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30305  
404 233-5501

### BALTIMORE

829 Munsey Bldg.  
7 No Calvert St.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
301 539-4777

### BOSTON

One Lincoln Plaza, #316  
Boston, MA 02111  
617-330-9678

### BUFFALO

3407 Delaware Ave.  
Kenmore, NY 14217  
716 877-6234

### CHICAGO

55 E. Jackson Blvd. #1870  
Chicago, IL 60604  
312 663-5500

### CINCINNATI

105 W. Fourth Street #1008  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513 621-4020

### CLEVELAND

625 Hanna Bldg.  
Cleveland, OH 44115  
216 781-6035

### DALLAS

12890 Hillcrest Rd. #103  
Dallas, TX 75230  
214 387-2943

### DENVER

300 S. Dahlia, Rm. 201  
Denver, CO 80222  
303 320-1742

### DETROIT

163 Madison Ave.  
Detroit, MI 48226  
313 965-3353

### HOUSTON

2600 SW Freeway, #714  
Houston, TX 77098  
713 524-1133

### KANSAS CITY

2200 W. 75th Street #218  
Prairie Village, KS 66208  
913 236-8313

### LONG ISLAND

165 E. 56th Street  
New York, NY 10022  
212 751-4000

### LOS ANGELES

6505 Wilshire Blvd. #315  
Los Angeles, CA 90048  
213 655-7071

### MIAMI

3000 Biscayne Blvd. #412  
Miami, FL 33137  
305 576-4240

### MILWAUKEE

759 N. Milwaukee Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
414 291-2140

### MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL

17515 Wayzata Blvd. #201  
Minneapolis, MN 55426  
612 545-7001

### NEW JERSEY

303 Millburn Avenue  
Millburn, NJ 07041  
201 379-7844

### NEW YORK

165 E. 56th Street  
New York, NY 10022  
212 751-4000

### ORANGE COUNTY

1100 Main Street, #D1  
Irvine, CA 92714  
714 660-8525

### PHILADELPHIA

1616 Walnut St. #2106  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215 732-4000

### PHOENIX

2021 No. 7th Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85006  
602 258-8354

### PITTSBURGH

300 S. Craig, #224  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
412 683-7927

### PORTLAND

1220 SW Morrison #930  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
503 295-6761

### ST. LOUIS

7750 Clayton Rd. #103  
St. Louis, MO 63117  
314 647-2519

### SAN DIEGO

8950 Villa LaJolla Dr. #2210  
LaJolla, CA 92037  
619 546-8777

### SAN FRANCISCO

121 Steuart Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415 777-3820

### SARASOTA/TAMPA

12902 A National Drive  
Tampa, FL 33617  
813 985-9145

### SEATTLE

1411 Joseph Vance Bldg.  
1402 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206 622-6315

### SOUTH CENTRAL FLORIDA

900 N. Federal Highway  
Boca Raton, Florida 33432  
407 368-0499

### WASHINGTON D.C.

2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202 265-2000

### WESTCHESTER

235 Mamaroneck Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10605  
914 948-5585

**THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE**  
**Institute of Human Relations**  
**165 East 56th Street**  
**New York, New York 10022-2746**

April 1991

Single copy \$4.00  
Quantity prices on request