קוראי

18

4290/15

Drafts
etc. of MSC's
statements
Teheran 22/4-15/5/68

הוועידה הבינלאומית
לזכויות האדם
1968

שם תיק: הועידה הבינלאומית לזכויות האדם
מזהה פיזי: חצ-4290/15
מזהה פריט: 000mi4v
כתובת: 2-120-3-19-8
תאריך הדפסה: 08/02/2018

4290/15

Please check against delivery.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Statement in Exercise of Right of Reply by

Ambassador Michael Comay,
Chairman of Israel Delegation
in Plenary Session
on 6 May 1968

Madame President,

My delegation, representing a nation of two-and-a-half million people, finds itself engaged in debate with representatives of the 50 million Arabs around us. Now the representative of the Soviet Union has thrown into the scale his 200 million fellow-citizens. It seems formidable odds, but fortunately truth has no respect for numbers.

The Soviet Union had a sinister share of the responsibility for the Middle East conflict, by heavily arming and encouraging its Arab client states. After the war and the Arab defeat, the Soviet Union set about recouping its influence in these Arab countries by heavily re-arming them, and by politically backing their cause at the United Nations. The USSR has the right to determine its own Middle East policies; but my delegation cannot but feel that the Soviet Union could now help more effectively to promote a peace settlement if it were to adopt a more even-handed and balanced posture as between the parties to the conflict. For instance, we could have been spared today's violent intervention in support of the Arab attack on Israel's respect for human rights.

We have our own fault to find with the Soviet Union's respect for human rights in certain respects; and in particular the deliberate and shabby repression of the religious and cultural rights of its Jewish community. Let me quote a message on this subject from a man whose memory has been venerated at this Conference. I refer to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The following message was sent by him, little more than a year ago on December 4, 1966 to the Ad Hoc Commission on Human Rights:

"In the Name of Humanity . . ."
A Statement of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The attempt to liquidate spiritually the Jewish people in Soviet Russia is something that we must not allow. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Injustice to any people is a threat to justice to all people.

I can not stand idly by, even though I live in the United States and even though I happen to be an American Negro, and not be concerned about what happens to my brothers and sisters who happen to be Jews in Soviet Russia.

For what happens to them happens to me and to you, and we must be concerned.

I am profoundly shocked by the treatment of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I should like to add my voice to the list of distinguished people of all faiths who have called the injustices perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union to the attention of the world.

The struggle of the Negro people for freedom is inextricably interwoven with the universal struggle of all peoples to be free from discrimination and oppression. The Jewish people must be given their full rights as Soviet citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR itself.

In the name of humanity, I urge that the Soviet Government end all the discriminatory measures against its Jewish community.

I will not remain silent in the face of injustice."

The Communist Parties in Italy, Australia, Canada and elsewhere have protested against the policy of the Soviet Union against Israel. They have opposed the support given by the USSR to what they describe as feudal Arab regimes.

Listening to the representative of the Soviet Union, I was reminded of the old adage about people in glass houses not throwing stones.

It is particularly repugnant to hear a Soviet representative loosely refer to Nazism in this context. We have not forgotten how gallantly the Russian people fought against the Nazi invaders, and how many millions of Russians died in bringing about the down fall of Hitler. The comparison now made may curry some favour with the Arab world. But it is no less odious because it comes from the representative of a great power using abuse against a small country for purposes of its own. We are not frightened by abuse, which simply discredits the abuser.

The Soviet representative has said much about the United Nations and alleged Israel aggression. The Soviet representative is misleading his audience. Let the United Nations record speak for itself.

We now hear from Soviet spokesmen that Israel was an aggressor even in 1948. It is a constant source of astonishment how short official memory can be.

In 1947 and 1948 the Soviet Union gave its blessing to the Jewish national independence movement, fully supported the establishment of the State of Israel, while denouncing Arab aggression against Israel.

After that we witnessed a revival of anti-Jewish sentiment in the Soviet Union for political purposes, which reached its peak in the infamous doctors plot towards the end of Stalin's lifetime. It is disturbing to find something of that spirit creeping back into the Soviet utterance today.

I would in conclusion say again to the representative of the Soviet Union, that my delegation is totally unimpressed by the attack we have just heard. We are fully aware of the cynical motivation behind it.

Just two sentences regarding the statement by the representative of Iraq. As usual, he tries to bolster up a poor case by personal references:

(a) I have no direct responsibility for the administration of Israel-held territories.

(b) I shall refrain from saying what I think about General Von Horn. He has caused sufficient embarrassment already to his own government, and to the Secretary-General and Dr. Bunche, who both enjoyed the dubious distinction of being personally attacked by the General.

RETURN SVP

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

Israel.

~~U.S.S.R.~~

(1)

Madame President,

My delegation, representing a nation of 2½ million people, finds itself engaged in debate with representatives of the 50 million Arabs around us. Now the ~~this~~ rep. of the Soviet Union has thrown into the scale his 200-million fellow-citizens. It seems formidable odds, but fortunately truth is no respecter of numbers.

(2)

The Soviet Union had a ~~sinister~~ share of the responsibility for the Middle East conflict, by heavily arming and encouraging its Arab client states. After the ~~Soviet~~ Arab defeat in the war and the Arab defeat, the Soviet Union set about recompiling its influence in these Arab countries by heavily re-arming them, and by politically backing their cause at the United Nations. The USSR has the right to determine its own Middle East policies; but my

delegation cannot but feel that the Soviet Union could now help more effectively to promote a peace settlement if it were to adopt a more even-handed and balanced posture as between the parties to the conflict. For instance, we could have been spared today's violent intervention in support of the Arab attack on Israel's respect for human rights.

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES
سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

We have our own fault to find with the Soviet Union's respect for human rights in certain respects; and in particular the deliberate and shabby repression of the religious and cultural rights of its Jewish community. Let me quote a message on this subject from a man whose memory has been venerated at this conference. I refer to Dr Martin Luther King, Jr.

36

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

The following message ~~was sent~~ (little more than a year ago) was sent by him ~~to~~ on Dec. 4, 1966 to the Ad Hoc Commission on Human Rights:

(Quote)

3(c)

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

The Communist Parties in Italy, Australia, Canada + elsewhere have protested against the policy of the Soviet Union against Israel. They have opposed the support given by the U.S.S.R. to [what they describe as] feudal regimes. Arab regimes.

We have our own fault to find with the Soviet Union's respect for human rights in certain respects; and in particular the shabby repression of the Helsinki cultural rights of its Jewish community

Martin Luther King Jr.

listening to the rep. of the Soviet Union, I was reminded of the old adage about people in glass houses not throwing stones.

It is particularly repugnant to hear a Soviet representative loosely refer to ~~use the term~~ nazism in this context. We have not forgotten

(5)

How gallantly the Russian people fought against the nazi invaders, & how many millions of Russians died in bringing about the downfall of Hitler. We also recall how before the nazi invasion it was the Soviet Union that signed a pact with Hitler Germany. Now the comparison & may do some favour to the writer in the Arab world. But

(6)

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

it is no less odious because it comes from the rep. of a great power using abuse against a small country for purposes of its own political expediency. We are not threatened by abuse, when simply discredits the abuser. The Soviet representative has said much about the United Nations and having intervened against allegat Israel agression. The Soviet repres representative is misleading

his audience. Let the United Nations record speak for itself. Nor appeal to the thesis advanced by the representatives of ~~the~~ U.N. resolutions

We would like to see a different face for the Soviet Union — the Soviet Union which sponsored and

We now hear from Soviet spokesmen that Israel was an aggressor even in 1948. It is a constant source of astonishment how short Israel memories can be.

In 1947 - 1948 the Soviet Union gave its blessing to the Jewish national independence movement, ~~fully supported the establishment of Israel, and~~ condemned

~~Support for the~~ fully supported the establishment of the State of Israel, while denouncing Arab aggression against Israel.

After that we witnessed a revival of anti-Jewish sentiment in the Soviet Union for political purposes, that reached its peak in the infamous ~~plot~~ doctors' plot towards the end of Stalin. It is disturbing to find something of that spirit creeping back into the Soviet utterances today.

* They severed all diplomatic relations with Israel.

(10)

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

~~[illegible]~~

I would in conclusion say again to the rep. of the Soviet Union, that my delegation is ~~totally~~ unimpressed by the ~~[illegible]~~ attack we have just heard. We ~~[illegible]~~ are fully aware of the cynical motivation behind it.

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES
سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

Just two sentences regarding the statement by the rep. of Iraq. As usual, he tries to bolster up a poor case by personal references.

(a) I have no direct responsibility for the ~~affairs of the~~ administration of Israel-held ~~territories~~.

(b) I shall refrain from saying what I think about Gen. Von Horn. He has caused sufficient embarrassment already to

his own government,
and to the Secretary-
General and Dr.
Bunche who both enjoyed the
dubious distinction of being personally
~~both personally~~
attacked by the General.
~~in the book~~ Quoted
~~today~~.

Reserve right to reply
reserve right to reply to other
speakers in the debate,
if necessary.

Please check against delivery.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Plenary Session

Right of Reply to the U.S.S.R.
on 6 May 1968

Madame President,

My delegation, representing a nation of two-and-a-half million people, finds itself engaged in debate with representatives of the 50 million Arabs around us. Now the representative of the Soviet Union has thrown into the scale his 200 million fellow-citizens. It seems formidable odds, but fortunately truth has no respect for numbers.

The Soviet Union had a sinister share of the responsibility for the Middle East conflict, by heavily arming and encouraging its Arab client states. After the war and the Arab defeat, the Soviet Union set about recouping its influence in these Arab countries by heavily re-arming them, and by politically backing their cause at the United Nations. The USSR has the right to determine its own Middle East policies; but my delegation cannot but feel that the Soviet Union could now help more effectively to promote a peace settlement if it were to adopt a more even-handed and balanced posture as between the parties to the conflict. For instance, we could have been spared today's violent intervention in support of the Arab attack on Israel's respect for human rights.

We have our own fault to find with the Soviet Union's respect for human rights in certain respects; and in particular the deliberate and shabby repression of the religious and cultural rights of its Jewish community. Let me quote a message on this subject from a man whose memory has been venerated at this Conference. I refer to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The following message was sent by him, little more than a year ago on December 4, 1966 to the Ad Hoc Commission on Human Rights:

"In the Name of Humanity . . ."

A Statement of Dr. Martin Luther Ki

[redacted]empt to liquidate spiritually the J[redacted]oviet Russia that we [redacted]not allow. Injustic[redacted]to justice [redacted]s a thre[redacted]

Please check against delivery.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Plenary Session

Right of Reply to the U.S.S.R.

on 6 May 1968

Madame President,

My delegation, representing a nation of two-and-a-half million people, finds itself engaged in debate with representatives of the 50 million strong around us. How the representatives of the Soviet Union have grown into this cosmic mix 200 million yellow-citizens. It seems formidable odds, but fortunately truth has no respect for numbers.

The Soviet Union had a solemn duty of the responsibility for the Middle East conflict, by heavily arming and encouraging its client states. After the war was lost and defeat, the Soviet Union set about recouping its influence by those that could be easily re-armed them, and by politically berating their cause at the United Nations. The USSR has the right to determine its own Middle East policies; but my delegation cannot but feel that the Soviet Union could now help more effectively to promote a peace settlement if it were to adopt a more even-handed and balanced posture as between the parties to the conflict. For instance, we could have opened today's violent intervention in support of the Arab attack on Israel's respect for human rights.

We have our own fault to find with the Soviet Union's respect for human rights in certain respects, and in particular the deliberate and shabby repression of the religious and cultural rights of the Jewish community. Let me quote a passage on this subject from a man whose memory has been venerated at this Conference. I refer to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The following passage was made by him, little more than a year ago on December 6, 1966 to the Ad Hoc Commission on human rights:

"In the Name of Humanity . . ."

A Statement of Dr. Martin Luther King

[illegible] to legislate against the [illegible] that we [illegible]. Legislation [illegible]

For what happens to them happens to me and to you, and we must be concerned.

I am profoundly shocked by the treatment of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I should like to add my voice to the list of distincguished people of all faiths who have called the injustices perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union to the attention of the world.

The struggle of the Negro people for freedom is inextricably interwoven with the universal struggle of all peoples to be free from discrimination and oppression. The Jewish people must be given their full rights as Soviet citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR itself.

In the name of humanity, I urge that the Soviet Government end all the discriminatory measures against its Jewish community.

I will not remain silent in the face of injustice."

The Communist Parties in Italy, Australia, Canada and elsewhere have protested against the policy of the Soviet Union against Israel. They have opposed the support given by the USSR to what they describe as feudal Arab regimes.

Listening to the representative of the Soviet Union, I was reminded of the old adage about people in glass houses not throwing stones.

It is particularly repugnant to hear a Soviet representative loosely refer to Nazism in this context. We have not forgotten how gallantly the Russian people fought against the Nazi invaders, and how many millions of Russians died in bringing about the down fall of Hitler. The comparison now made may curry some favour with the Arab world. But it is no less odious because it comes from the representative of a great power using abuse against a small country for purposes of its own. We are not frightened by abuse, which simply discredits the abuser.

The Soviet representative has said much about the United Nations and alleged Israel aggression. The Soviet representative is misleading his audience. Let the United Nations record speak for itself.

We now hear from Soviet spokesmen that Israel was an aggressor even in 1948. It is a constant source of astonishment how short official memory can be.

In 1947 and 1948 the Soviet Union gave its blessing to the Jewish national independence movement, fully supported the establishment of the State of Israel, while denouncing Arab aggression against Israel.

After that we witnessed a revival of anti-Jewish sentiment in the Soviet Union for political purposes, which reached its peak in the infamous doctors plot towards the end of Stalin's lifetime. It is disturbing to find something [illegible]ning back into the Soviet utterance today.

I would in conclusion say again to the representative of the Soviet Union, that my delegation is totally unimpressed by the attack we have just heard. We are fully aware of the cynical motivation behind it.

Just two sentences regarding the statement by the representative of Iraq. As usual, he tries to bolster up a poor case by personal references:

(a) I have no direct responsibility for the administration of Israel-held territories.

(b) I shall refrain from saying what I think about General Von Horn. He has caused sufficient embarrassment already to his own government, and to the Secretary-General and Dr. Bunche, who both enjoyed the dubious distinction of being personally attacked by the General.

December 5, 1966 20 Cents, Volume 33, No. 16

CONGRESS
A Journal of Opinion and Jewish Affairs
bi-WEEKLY

Special Issue

SILENCE AND YEARNING:

A Report and Analysis of the Status of Soviet Jewry...by MOSHE DECTER

Including: The Findings and Judgment of the Ad Hoc Commission on the Rights of Soviet Jews

John C. Bennett, George B. Ford, Emil Mazey, Bayard Rustin, Telford Taylor, Norman Thomas

This special issue of CONGRESS BI-WEEKLY is sponsored by the Commission on International Affairs of the American Jewish Congress and the Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews.

The Commission on International Affairs seeks to inform public opinion in the Jewish and general communities on issues affecting the status and security of Jews in foreign lands, the welfare of Israel, and the promotion of international human rights.

The Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews, formed on October 12, 1963, consists of more than 300 distinguished Americans—academic, scientific, labor, journalistic, clergy, political—who have united to express their concern about Soviet Jewry. The Conference sponsors are: Justice William O. Douglas, Dr. Merle Fainsod, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Dr. James A. Pike, Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch, Walter Reuther, Norman Thomas, Robert Penn Warren.

SILENCE AND YEARNING:

A Report and Analysis of the Status of Soviet Jewry

by Moshe Decter

The author of this study, MOSHE DECTER, is director of Jewish Minorities Research, which specializes in research and publication on the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Mr. Decter is the author of two books: *McCarthy and the Communists* (1954) and *The Profile of Communism* (1961). He has contributed articles to *American Heritage, Foreign Affairs, Commentary,* and other publications. He has also served as a writer-editor with the Voice of America and as Managing Editor of *The New Leader.*

The Foreword was contributed by RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD, president of the American Jewish Congress, and PHIL BAUM, director of the American Jewish Congress Commission on International Affairs.

Copyright © 1966 by the American Jewish Congress. Individual copies, 20¢; 25 to 100 copies, 15¢ each; over 100 copies, 10¢ each.

Volume 33 No. 16 December 5, 1966

CONTENTS

Foreword:
"Time is the Enemy . . ."
Arthur J. Lelyveld & Phil Baum 3
Soviet Jewry: A Current Survey 6
Passover and *Matzoth:* A Case History of Soviet Policy 13
Nationality, Language and Education 20
Cultural Facilities for Minorities 25
The Germans and the Jews: A Study in Contrast 27
The Sympathetic Treatment of the Armenians 35
Inner Tensions: The English-Speaking Communists Protest 38
Findings and Judgments of the Ad Hoc Commission on the Rights of Soviet Jews 41
Focus of Protest: The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry 46

CONGRESS
A Journal of Opinion and Jewish Affairs
bi-WEEKLY

Editor Herbert Poster
Associate Editor Maier Deshell

Publication Committee
Arthur A. Cohen, Jacqueline Levine, Theodore Mann, Shad Polier, Joachim Prinz, Leo Schwarz, Howard Squadron, Paul Vishny

CONGRESS BI-WEEKLY is published every other Monday from October through May excepting weeks of Jewish holidays, monthly in June and September, by the American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y. 10028. TRafalgar 9-4500. Annual subscription $4. Single copy 20¢. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. 43

Foreword

"Time Is the Enemy..."

Arthur J. Lelyveld
Phil Baum

FOR YEARS THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS HAS PRODUCED AMONG JEWS abroad not only deep anguish and compassion, but, at times, demoralizing confusion. The condition of Soviet Jews not only burdens the heart but apparently disturbs clear thinking. As a result, there is in some places a continuing uncertainty over the exact facts of Soviet Jewish life. And there is an even greater uncertainty, in still more places, over what these facts mean and what may effectively be done about them.

This special issue of CONGRESS BI-WEEKLY has, therefore, set for itself a hard and ambitious task. It seeks, at long last, to collate the currently available information and to present it in authoritative and accessible form. It seeks, beyond that, to consider those hesitations of policy and program that have sometimes stayed the hands even of Jewish communities and that perhaps explain why this urgent problem still has not everywhere been accorded the full attention and action it merits.

The separate background studies prepared so fully and lucidly by Moshe Decter describe the present status of Soviet Jewish life, placed in the context of the larger Soviet society. We believe this is the most comprehensive summary of the factual heart of our argument yet to appear. With this publication the facts and their meanings become readily available and there can no longer be reason either for ignorance or indifference.

We recognize, of course, that the presentation of facts and even clear interpretative analysis may not answer every question of policy or unambiguously define the practical measures that must follow. What is required, as in all instances of such presentations of data and analysis, are the subsequent operations of mind and imagination. On the other hand, we believe that certain conclusions do plainly emerge from the studies and findings in this issue.

It is, for example, overwhelmingly evident that the erosion of Soviet Jewish institutions represents a special form of the tragedy of European Jewry. The Soviet anti-Jewish policy does not, however, represent an attack upon the physical safety of Russian Jews. It is certainly in no way analagous to the monstrous and unspeakable crimes of Nazi Germany. There does not exist in the Soviet Union anything like the relentless racism which pursued Jews down the generations in Germany for the purpose of bringing about their imprisonment in camps and their destruction in crematoria. That barbarism has not returned and it is imperative that this be clearly understood. It should not be necessary to repeat warnings against such comparisons. The fact is that no reputable or significant figures or organizations indulge in them or practice such demagoguery.

We must, however, guard against creating the impression that every complaint over the treatment of Soviet Jews suffers from some funda-

mental defect of hysteria. We affirm that those who would complain of the treatment of Soviet Jews have an obligation to be responsible and accurate in their allegations. But there is, in our view, a corresponding obligation to avoid statements which might discredit necessary and responsible action in this area of protest against the discriminations visited on Soviet Jewry.

Similarly, there has been much pointless and misguided debate over the almost metaphysical point whether Jewish deprivation in the USSR constitutes "anti-Semitism." Under the present circumstances it is hard to imagine a more wasteful discussion. The matter of nomenclature is surely not decisive, and if "anti-Semitism" has troubling connotations then the term should be discarded. What is at issue is the deliberate effort by Soviet authorities to deprive corporate Jewish life of the means to preserve its collective existence and the denial to individual Jews of any opportunity to learn the meaning of their Jewish identity. Under any name this should be sufficient reason for expression of the utmost alarm.

Equality of Treatment

Some who would moderate the campaign for Soviet Jewish rights appear to argue that the factors eroding Russian Jewish life apply in the same way and in equal force against other segments of Soviet society and are probably part of the ineluctable processes of any Communist state. Mr. Decter's analysis (especially those portions of the argument relating to the Armenian and German nationalities in the Soviet Union) should make it clear that this is not the case and that we seek for Soviet Jews neither special consideration nor special privileges. We seek to obtain for Soviet Jews those same rights now accorded every other comparable group in the Soviet Union and in fact guaranteed by the theoretical postulates of Soviet society itself. At the same time, we remain deeply concerned with extending the range of human freedoms and human rights for all men in the Soviet Union, as indeed in every nation where their rights may be denied.

Accordingly, we reject the proposition that the loss of Jewish identity is inexorable in a Communist state. In every other country of the Soviet bloc, without exception, Jews do and are allowed to maintain Jewish schools and theatres, newspapers and communal organizations, and they do so without harm to the respective states in which they live and without doing violence to the precepts of theoretical Communism by which they are guided. Not only are these diverse Jewish communal institutions tolerated and allowed by these Communist governments, but in many cases they are subvented and supported by the State itself. We ask that the same opportunities be allowed Soviet Jews as are now being accorded Jewish minorities—not in London or Paris nor New York—but in Warsaw and in Budapest and, indeed, in all other member states of the Soviet bloc itself.

The Case for Yiddish

This accounts in part for the heavy emphasis placed in our demands upon the use and teaching of Yiddish. Yiddish is important in this context not only because of the intrinsic beauty and symbolic worth of the Yiddish language and literature, but because of the special standing Yiddish enjoys under Soviet law as the recognized tongue of Russian Jews as members of a separate Soviet nationality. American Jews sometimes argue that we have, in justice, no right to complain of the lack of Yiddish expression in the Soviet Union since, however regrettably, Yiddish has fallen into such low estate in our own country. How can we ask that Soviet Jewish children speak Yiddish when our own children do not do so? How can we ask that there be a Yiddish theatre in Moscow when New York has few indeed? How can we ask for Yiddish books and papers in Russia when they are read by limited numbers in America?

This misses the point entirely. We stress our demand for Yiddish in the Soviet Union because this is one of the few instruments for Jewish self-expression that can be claimed, at least theoretically, as of right. American Jews send their children to Sunday schools and Hebrew schools and day schools of every sort and description, and increasing numbers of American Jewish children are proficient in Hebrew. Jewish publications, journals and magazines abound. Zionist organizations function in every community and Jewish community relations bodies allow for participation as Jews in the great events and debates of American public life.

None of this is possible at present in the Soviet Union. There can be no Hebrew, no Zionism, no religious instruction of children, no Jewish presence in political discussions. One asks for Yiddish because one asks for what is possible. If Soviet Jews conceivably could gain access to anything like the vast institutional array of American Jewish life, then assuredly the demands for Yiddish would be less insistent. But when Yiddish becomes one of the few permitted forms of survival then it must carry a weight and importance it might not otherwise have and its existence becomes a crucial emblem of Jewish collective existence.

It does not follow, of course, that even if Yiddish schools or other facilities were to be allowed that they would satisfy the need for meaningful Russian Jewish life. Indeed, there is every likelihood that Yiddish schools and other facilities would be allowed to be Jewish only linguistically and that in terms of content and curriculum they would be restricted to the propagation of official views. Conceivably, one might have

Yiddish schools in the Soviet Union that would teach Jewish children in Yiddish to deny Jewish peoplehood and to be hostile to Israel and unfriendly to the rest of the world Jewish communities. Nonetheless, this is a risk that must be assumed in the hope that the language, with its inevitable associations of history, traditions and practice, would, despite all handicaps and however inadequately, provide a cement and link with traditional Jewish experience.

There are those who challenge our right to ask for anything on behalf of Soviet Jews. We have no mandate from them. How dare we speak on their behalf? How do we know what they want? It is true that there is no way of knowing adequately the desire of Soviet Jews except by a host of inferences. This indeed is our own principal complaint. There is no address for Soviet Jews, there is no central organization, no representative body, no one to ask.

Soviet authorities insist that the paucity of Jewish facilities in the USSR reflects a lack of desire among Soviet Jews for them. The facts of Soviet life recorded by Mr. Decter decisively refute this claim. In 1959 almost half a million Jews recorded Yiddish as their first language. Every time a Yiddish book appears its supply is exhausted immediately upon publication and copies become unobtainable. Yiddish concerts—intermittent and inadequate though they are—because they are the single cultural medium still available to Jews, invariably attract overflow audiences. Mr. Decter cites additional evidence to testify to the yearning of Jews for indigenous cultural fare. The festival of *Simhat Torah* each year finds Jews crowding the streets as the simplest form of affirmation of this Jewish identity.

In any case, there is no need to rely on conjecture, or even on the anecdotal account of travellers in the Soviet Union. (Reports of Jews with shadowed eyes who implore, "Do not forget us" are offset by other reports of somebody else's cousins who say, "We're fine the way we are.") We do not desire that Soviet Jews be coerced into a feeling of fellowship or identity that is not authentic. We therefore propose a simple test: We challenge Soviet authorities to let there be established in the Soviet Union a single Yiddish school, a Yiddish newspaper, a Yiddish theatre, a Yiddish publishing house, as a means of demonstrating the response of Soviet Jews. And if the school is not filled to capacity, and if the newspaper is not over-subscribed, and the theatre is not sold out, if the supply of books is not exhausted—then we may be persuaded of the reality of alleged Jewish self-alienation.

There is probably a variety of reasons for the inflexible position of the USSR on Soviet Jewry. None of these, when they are cited, would seem so formidable as to warrant the risk of continued exposure to embarrassment of the Soviet Union in all parts of the world. We believe the problem of restoring Jewish rights in the Soviet Union is not insuperable precisely because the current invidious Soviet policy has no substantial purpose. Eventually, we feel, it must become clear to Soviet leadership that in terms of Soviet self-interest it is imperative to remove a defect that compromises all Soviet claims for a concern for human rights and that returns no commensurate advantage. It must be our purpose to insure that this realization becomes increasingly evident to Soviet leadership.

Appeal to Reason

The Soviet Union is, of course, a powerful country. It is sheer folly to believe that it can be coerced—or persuaded—into taking action which it regards as inimical to its ultimate interest. But that does not mean that there is no room and no occasion for public protest. On the contrary, the very assessment by the Soviet Union of its interests is directly affected by the kind and extent of public protest that is raised abroad over a policy that undermines confidence in its professed attachment to human rights. The minor concessions that have thus far been granted—the limited baking of *matzoth,* the promise of *siddurim,* the publication of a few more Jewish books—seem to have been in direct response to external demand.

The one absolute prerequisite is that the demand for the restoration of Jewish rights be kept entirely separate from other grievances that may be laid against the Soviet Union. Nothing could be more harmful to Russian Jewish survival than the suggestion that these complaints are a facade for an anti-Communist crusade. For this reason, as Mr. Decter shows, protests within the international Communist movement itself are of optimum effect.

The major burden of responsibility in this struggle will be carried by those who are unequivocally dedicated to the cause of freedom. It must in the main be carried on by liberals, by Jews and non-Jews who are disassociated from the Cold War and unambiguously identified with the universal pursuit of liberty. And they must be prepared to press this grievance through a variety of means. The case for Soviet Jews must be presented by earnest debate, by exhortation, by reasoned argument and by public demonstration. Depending upon circumstances, if our arguments and our positions are sound and reasonable, there is no forum that is *a priori* inappropriate.

This is a moment of opportunity. It is a moment that may not be repeated. The internal resources of Soviet Jewry are not limitless. To persist thus far they have had to draw upon deep reserves of stamina and morale, but no human community can forever inhabit so shadowy and marginal a world. Soviet Jews are subject to swift attrition and time is the ineluctable enemy. Our generation still has a chance to help. Should we fail, our children's generation will have no such opportunity.

Soviet Jewry: A Current Survey

DURING THE PAST YEAR AND A HALF, A SPATE OF events, large and small, have created considerable confusion about the direction of Soviet policy on the Jews. Some events have given rise to guarded hopes, others have tended to shatter those hopes.

Are these hopes grounded in fact? If so, to what extent and in what way? If not, what is the meaning of the events cited as concrete evidence of progress? Inadequate information or misunderstanding can only confuse the issue. A survey of developments is therefore required in order to gain the proper perspective. To lay the groundwork for this task, it is useful to restate the situation of the Soviet Jews and the nature of Soviet policy.

Politically, demographically and psychologically, the USSR's more than three million Jews have always been uniquely vulnerable to prejudice and discrimination. Dispersed throughout the country, they are everywhere a small but noticeable minority, living on territory where anti-Semitism has an ancient lineage. Although the Jews are officially defined as a nationality—a secular entity, combining ethnic, historical and cultural components—many remain loyal to the faith of their fathers. Precisely because of the religio-ethnic duality of Jewish history and because of the ready availability of anti-Semitic myths, their very loyalty to Judaism has laid the Jews open to pressures that exceed in depth and nature those to which the regime's official atheism subjects all other religions.

Soviet anti-religious propaganda has characteristically resorted to traditional anti-Semitic social stereotypes, and, by accusing Judaism of fostering Jewish "bourgeois nationalism," has all too frequently called into question the political loyalty of the Jews. Suspicion is inescapably reinforced in the prejudiced mind by the bonds that link Soviet Jews to Jewish communities and families outside the USSR—especially in the United States and Israel, where a majority of the world Jewish community lives. Thus, the very persistence, dispersal and mutuality of the Jews tend to confirm and exacerbate hoary anti-Semitic fears of the wandering, international Jew—the "rootless cosmopolitan" of Stalin's last years, a mythic image that maintains a flourishing "underground" existence which can only be called "popular" anti-Semitism. Non-Jews as well as Jews breathe this poisoned atmosphere.

Rooted in irrational hostility and virulent prejudice, Soviet policy aims at the forcible, involuntary assimilation of Soviet Jewry. This policy has deprived the Jews of the rights, institutions and facilities—cultural, religious, educational and communal—whereby they might perpetuate and enhance their life as a self-aware historic group.

The policy is implemented in an atmosphere in which "popular" anti-Semitism has been tacitly encouraged from on high by the dissemination in the public prints of negative stereotypes of Judaism, the Jewish people, Jewish history and values, and the State of Israel. Moreover, it has been decades since overt anti-Jewish acts have been punished by law, and anti-Semitic prejudice actively discouraged by the vast educational apparatus consistently used in the USSR to inculcate officially approved public values. At the same time, severe discrimination is practiced against the Jews in key sectors of higher education and employment.

Deprived of the institutions by which a group maintains its distinctive life, prevented from acquiring a knowledge of and a natural pride in its heritage, intimidated from varied and unhampered association with other Jews at home and abroad, assailed by the atmosphere of prejudice and discrimination, humiliated by the accumulated experience of this treatment over the decades—Soviet Jewry, this great and ancient community, stands on the verge of disappearance.

Impact of World Opinion

All the essential elements of this anti-Jewish policy were introduced by Stalin, but they have been retained virtually intact by his successors. As the outside world became aware of the facts, criticism and protest began to be voiced—and as the protests waxed stronger, the Soviets began to react. There can be no doubt of the growing seriousness of the response, nor of the reasons for it. Since the death of Stalin and the unmasking of his foul deeds by former Chairman Khrushchev and his colleagues, an increasing measure of rationality has been gradually introduced into Soviet life. Soviet leadership has inevitably become more responsive to the material and spiritual needs of the Soviet people, to the moral demands of the Soviet intelligentsia, to the restiveness of client Communist Parties in both Eastern Europe and the West, and to the moral susceptibilities of Western public opinion. Moscow's arch-rivalry with Peking has doubtless helped to accelerate that responsiveness.

Although the Jews have thus far remained the sole exception to this process of gradual liberalization and rationalization of Soviet life, the events of the past year and a half, and their tempo, testify to Soviet sensitivity and responsiveness to world public opinion, and to Soviet susceptibility to policy modification—even with regard to the Jews.

Range of Response

There have been roughly three stages in the evolution of the Soviet response. In the first, Soviet spokesmen tended simply to ignore or bluntly deny the charges. That stage ended about two years ago, when it became clear to them that this simple approach failed to stop the protests. In the ensuing stage, the Soviets went over to an intense, vigorous propaganda counter-offensive. This consisted of coupling the denials and evasions with evidence that purported to show the voluntary nature of Jewish assimilation and the major role played by Jews in Soviet life.

It is reasonable to suppose that, perhaps in the middle of 1964 (when it must have become quite clear to the Soviet policy-makers that the counter-offensive was not working), Moscow took some decisions which have led to the third stage, the current one. It is one in which some token concessions, some promises and some slight but real changes have been combined with a rather more sophisticated propaganda line that seeks to exploit the hopes that have been aroused.

The key to the current stage, the great watershed of world protest and of Soviet response to it, was the "Kichko Affair," a remarkable symbolic, psychological and political breakthrough. Trofim K. Kichko, a specialist in anti-Judaism propaganda, was the author of *Judaism Without Embellishment,* a virulently anti-Semitic book, replete with Nazi-like cartoons, published in late 1963 by the Ukrainian Academy of Science in Kiev. It became known to the outside world in February 1964, whereupon all the floodgates of outrage burst wide open.

The highlight of the protest was the chagrin expressed first by the Jewish Communists and, subsequently, by the general Communist movements and their peripheries in Western Europe, Latin America, Australia and the United States. So determined and so feeling were these expressions that the Soviets actually found it necessary to backtrack. The book was criticized by the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, and the criticism was published in the Soviet press, in addition to which the book was apparently withdrawn—*a unique Soviet reaction to foreign protest.*

Phenomenal though it was, this denouement merely restored the situation to the *status quo ante.* As the basic policy of deprivation and discrimination remained in force, widespread condemnation of it persisted. In response, the Soviet leadership, already deeply affected by the Kichko Affair, has apparently undertaken a new approach, the major consequences of which must now be reviewed.

For three years, beginning in May 1961, the Soviets conducted a wide-ranging, multifaceted campaign against such deeply entrenched and widely practiced crimes as currency speculation, black marketing, bribery, and embezzlement of State and public property. All the major institutions of State and Party, including the security police, the courts and the press, were enlisted in the campaign. Thousands of Soviet citizens were pilloried in the press, tried and condemned to prison or worse. Among them were many innocents, as some Soviet papers have since admitted.

The most appalling feature of the campaign was the use of capital punishment. Insofar as can be ascertained from a study of the Soviet press in that period, at least 250 persons were so penalized. More than fifty per cent were Jews, and in some parts of the country—for example, the Ukraine, the most anti-Semitic area of all—the percentage rose to eighty. These trials and death sentences were carried out to the accompaniment of an extraordinary press campaign that purveyed the most vicious anti-Semitic stereotypes.

By mid-1964, the campaign slowed to a crawl, and with it the anti-Jewish press campaign; the singling out of Jews for capital punishment ended. This was in no small measure effectuated by the systematic worldwide protests mounted by the Jewish community, with the active support of such figures as Bertrand Russell, Martin Luther King, Jr., Norman Thomas, Arthur Miller, and many others. Throughout, growing Soviet sensitivity was revealed by a mountain of defensive press releases, letters to foreign newspapers and even a lengthy letter from Khrushchev to Russell.

However, the virtual elimination of the campaign, and of its anti-Semitic implications and consequences, still does not represent any change in the basic Soviet policy of attrition against Jewish group identity, though it does signify an easier atmosphere for Soviet Jews.

Implications of Sovietish Heimland

In the autumn of 1961, a Yiddish literary bimonthly, *Sovietish Heimland* (Soviet Homeland), was established—the first Jewish periodical permitted on Soviet soil since Stalin liquidated all Jewish cultural institutions in 1948-49. It is presided over by Aaron Vergelis, a mediocre poet who is regarded by most Soviet Jewish intellectuals as a Party hack and who is an apologist for the cultural assimilation of Soviet Jewry. This unpropitious factor has nevertheless not inhibited the evolution of the magazine into something rather different from what was intended for it. To begin with, in January 1965 it was transformed into a monthly, and the number of its pages increased from 128 to160. (Its edition of 25,000 has, however, remained fixed; nor has there been any reaction from Vergelis or his superiors to the demands of the Jewish readers in various Soviet cities for the establishment of more journals.) In addition, the magazine has published poetry, criticism and fiction

of intrinsic Jewish interest and of genuine literary caliber.

Most important, however, and despite its official function, *Sovietish Heimland* has published ideological articles on Jewish literature and literary history that mark a significant departure from past Soviet, and Soviet Jewish, attitudes. In substance, they recognize the historical continuity and positive cultural value of Jewish literary creation from the Bible to the present day. This acceptance of Biblical, rabbinic and even medieval Jewish literature as a legitimate product of Jewish culture is all the more remarkable in that it explicity honors the Hebrew language and Hebrew literature, which have been proscribed since the early 1920s. (Heretofore, Yiddish has been the only language officially allowed the Soviet Jews.) Another aspect of this change has been the fairly consistent publication in the past year of literary works by Jewish Communists and fellow-travelers in other East European countries, and even in Western Europe, the United States and Israel—and of Jewish literary news from all over the world.

All this, in turn, necessarily implies recognition of historical facts which Soviet theory and practice have for the most part either disregarded or rejected—the fact of the existence of an entity known as the Jewish people, of its ancient and continuous history, of its uninterrupted, millenial cultural and spiritual creation, of its contemporary unity and the mutual interest of its various geographical segments.

Although it is far too early to know whether these shifts hold much promise, they do constitute fundamental, if tacit, theoretical changes. In a country where theory and ideology still play a decisive role in molding policy, such changes can form the basis for the creation of genuine Jewish cultural, communal and educational institutions. That they do not yet even hint of such institutions is revealed by the repeated and fervent demands that continue to be made for them in the West, even by Communists. Clearly, however, this significant ideological shift reflects both growing Soviet Jewish courage within a somewhat more relaxed general atmosphere and the incessant pressure from outside.

New Assault on Religion

Beginning in 1957—ironically, during the early stage of the very period when some fresh air was filtering into other areas of Soviet life—Soviet Jewry experienced a new encroachment: the ban on public baking and sale of *matzoth,* the unleavened bread indispensable to the observance of Passover. In the next five years, the ban spread from the outlying districts, until, by 1962, it had virtually blanketed the entire country.

This was not merely a stroke against a key religious rite, but a blow against Jewish group identity as such. For Passover, virtually unique among Jewish festivals, represents a national-historical as well as a religious motif. Even secular, atheist Soviet Jews are known to have a special feeling for that holiday and for its national and family symbolisms and associations. To prohibit the production and distribution of the key element in the observance of the festival obviously carried the process of attrition against Jewish group identity very far indeed.

Jewish communities around the world understood these implications, and a great furor arose in 1963 and 1964. The Soviets met this wave of protest defensively, with transparent evasions and prevarications. By the spring of 1965, aware that these tactics would no longer serve, they permitted synagogues in Moscow, Leningrad and a few other cities to organize the baking and sale of *matzoth* for those who registered for them. And for Passover 1966 they added another ten or so cities to the list.

Clearly, this was a response to protest abroad; it marked the first slight reversal of the policy of the preceding eight years. Still, the partial lifting of the *matzoth* ban applied only to certain show cities; it remained in force in most of the country. A complete reversal would make *matzoth* readily available for all, with no registration of names; it would also make it possible for non-religious Jews to purchase them, as was once the case, in State stores rather than in synagogues. Such a reversal would, of course, only return the situation to where it was before 1957. It would not in itself even begin to undo the wide range of discriminations to which the Jewish community, religious and secular, is subjected.

Yiddish Literature: Token Revival

In 1948, Stalin destroyed all Jewish communal-cultural institutions, including publishing houses and printing presses. From then until 1959, there was blank silence. In 1959, two Yiddish volumes, by classic writers long dead, were published in editions of 30,000. For unknown reasons, 1960 was skipped, but the following year three more classics were published. All five were slim volumes of selections from the vast creation of the Yiddish masters. From 1961 until 1964, the silence of the desert again prevailed.

Toward the end of 1964, however, another Yiddish book was published. Entitled *Azoy Leben Mir* (This Is How We Live), it was a collection of twenty-odd pieces, most of which had earlier been published in *Sovietish Heimland,* in glorification of the acculturation of Soviet Jews. There was hardly a word in it of Jewish life as such. It was clear that this was a propaganda effort intended mainly for export. In February 1965, a more genuine literary effort appeared, *Horizonten* (Horizons), an anthology of

Yiddish poetry—the first publication of authentic Yiddish belles-lettres by living Jewish writers since 1948. In late September 1965, again for the first time since 1948, an entire Yiddish novel by a living Soviet Jewish writer appeared: *Erev* (On The Eve) by Ilya Shectman. In late December, another Yiddish novel, *Himmel un Erd* (Heaven and Earth) by Notte Lurye, appeared. Finally, in January 1966 a slim volume of *Selected Poetry* by Moishe Taif was published. *Horizonten* and *Erev* were published in editions of 5,000 each; *Himmel un Erd* in an edition of 10,000; and *Selected Poetry* in an edition of 6,000—not very large editions, especially considering that some substantial portion of each was consigned for shipment abroad.

Four books in the course of a year are obviously better than none, though many questions have been raised about the paucity and slowness of the publication program. It is even possible to assume the fulfillment of recent Soviet promises that several more Yiddish books will be published in the coming months. But the appearance of a handful of books cannot be mistaken, as Soviet apologists at home and abroad seek to do, for a real publication program, nor can it obscure the fact that genuine cultural institutions —i.e., a Jewish publishing house, of the kind that used to abound in the USSR—has been neither promised nor planned.

Unhonored Promises

In the summer of 1965, a group of American rabbis visited several Soviet cities and met at length with Rabbi Yehudah Leib Levin, the rabbi of Moscow's main synagogue. Three of the rabbis were permitted to preach for five minutes each from the pulpit. In his private conversations, Rabbi Levin told the visiting rabbis of three promises recently made him by the authorities: permission for the publication of 10,000 prayerbooks in Hebrew; reopening in late 1965 of the Moscow *yeshivah*, the rabbinical seminary first opened in 1957 with a handful of students, but virtually shut down since 1962; the free availability of *matzoth* in Moscow for Passover 1966. At the same time, Rabbi Levin rather pathetically begged his guests not to mention these promises from the pulpit in Moscow, for fear that his congregation's hopes, once raised, might subsequently be dashed by a governmental reversal.

A curiously sad note has accompanied these promises. For, though silence has prevailed about them inside the USSR, the American rabbis were able to report them when they returned home. Moreover, Rabbi Levin had conveyed the same promises to other foreign visitors during the same period, and he himself issued a statement containing the identical promises—for broadcast by Radio Moscow on its short-wave English-language transmission to North America.

Of these three promises, only one has been honored—and that, only partially: the baking of *matzoh* —a clear response by a more rational leadership to several years of public pressure abroad. However, the authorities have reneged on their commitment to reopen the *yeshiva* and on the publication of Hebrew prayerbooks.

But even if these small concessions were finally granted, they would in no way eliminate the grave institutional discrimination suffered by Soviet religious Jewry. For, unlike other recognized religious denominations, they are forbidden their own religious publication facilities and institutions. This prohibition, in turn, is part of an even wider-ranging discrimination: unlike all other religious bodies in the USSR, the Jews are forbidden a central religious organizational structure that would provide not only for publications, but for the production of religious facilities and articles, and for communication and formal contact between widely scattered congregations.

Indeed, in the absence of such a center, Soviet Jewry has no means of legally accepted affiliation or association with Jewish religious bodies abroad. Thus, for example, one cannot properly characterize the group of visiting American rabbis in Moscow as a "delegation"—something that can be said of such visits by foreign Christian and Moslem groups. Their appearance in the pulpit was surely a comfort to Moscow's religious Jews, for it dramatically signified that American Jewry had not forgotten them. But it was nevertheless a strictly informal, one-shot affair, a private visit by individual rabbis. Despite the efforts to inflate the significance of these events and promises, they remain disparate, isolated phenomena, which cannot replace or be mistaken for religious-communal institutions.

The Policy of Silence

"There are no memorials at Babi Yar." With this line, the daring young Soviet poet, Yevgeni Yevtushenko, opened his world-famous poem of 1961, "Babi Yar," a searing indictment of anti-Semitism, even in his own country and in his own day. That line symbolizes the fact that the catastrophic Jewish martyrdom at the hands of the Germans in World War II has been passed over in virtual silence in the USSR.

Two developments in the second half of 1965 are being cited as indicative of a change. For one thing, the City Council of Kiev has announced that it will erect a monument to the "victims of fascism" at or near Babi Yar (a suburb of Kiev which is the site of a mass slaughter of Jews in 1941). Twenty-five years later, there is nothing there to remind the world, or

the Ukrainians (who collaborated happily with the Nazis), of the graves of scores of thousands of Jews. Thus far, there has been almost no mention in the Soviet press of the decision to erect the monument. Moreover, even the Soviet propaganda for foreign consumption makes it quite clear that the specific and unique Jewish tragedy at Babi Yar will be lost in the shuffle; for already the line is being taken that "the victims of Nazism at Babi Yar included members of various Soviet nationalities—Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, and others. . . . " In other words, Jews are merely *among* those slaughtered there. This policy, aimed at obscuring the nature and scope of the Jewish tragedy under Nazi occupation, had led, four years ago, to Yevtushenko's being forced to alter his poem. The poem was subjected to a vicious attack by a number of Stalinist literary critics—and, indeed, by Khrushchev himself. In the end, Yevtushenko was pressured into revising a few of the lines, so as to de-emphasize the Jewish martyrdom at Babi Yar.

That this policy is being carried forward is revealed by two very recent developments of 1966: In the summer, the popular youth monthly, *Yunost,* published in installments a "documentary novel" called *Babi Yar,* by a young Russian novelist, Anatoli Kuznetsov. His novel, though it does perhaps for the first time in many years of Soviet publication contain graphic descriptions of the Nazi slaughter of Jews in 1941, carries forward the accepted official line that Jews were only "among" the many butchered and buried at Babi Yar. Similarly, in November 1966, the Soviet propaganda agency Novosti released a report, *not publicized at home,* of a meeting at Babi Yar at which a plaque was dedicated carrying the inscription that on this spot a monument will be erected to the "victims of fascism" at Babi Yar—with no word about the Jewish holocaust.

The continuing ambiguity of the situation, however, is revealed in three events in the fall of 1965 in widely separated parts of the USSR. In October, a major war crimes trial of six Latvian Nazi collaborators in Riga clearly pointed up the Jewish tragedy. On the other hand, at a similar trial held in Vilna, Lithuania, in December, the Jewish tragedy was barely brought out. And it is not mentioned at all in the inscription on a monument erected in November to the victims of Nazism at Smolensk.

A general reversal would naturally be reflected not only in one or two instances, but in a vast array of books, memoirs, monuments and observances all over the country, and in all relevant languages, be it Yiddish, Hebrew, Russian, Ukrainian or Lithuanian—as is being done in other countries. (At Ponar, the Nazi slaughterhouse of Lithuanian Jewry just outside Vilna, there stands a memorial to the victims. The Yiddish inscription on it was torn down by hooligans more than a decade ago and has never been restored. The Lithuanian and Russian inscriptions significantly fail to reveal that Ponar, like Babi Yar, was the site of Jewish martyrdom.)

Quite aside from the question of historical justice, a crucial problem is that popular anti-Semitism in such places as the Ukraine, Lithuania and Moldavia, where it has been most virulent, has only been encouraged by the systematic silence of the authorities about the tragedy of the Jews in those areas. A reversal of the policy of silence would do far more than redress the injustice rendered by Soviet history books; it would also instruct the local anti-Semites that hostility to the Jews is no longer tolerable. Soviet Jews are waiting on this.

The Anti-Israel Stance

Ever since the first flush of Soviet support for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish State there, the USSR has demonstrated consistent and bitter hostility to Israel, and has regularly portrayed it and its diplomatic representatives in the Soviet Union as agents and tools of Western imperialism and subversion. This has reflected not only Soviet support for the Arabs in the Middle East, but a serious attempt to intimidate Soviet Jewry itself and to frighten it away from its traditional feelings of kinship and warmth for Israel.

Recent developments indicate a rather more ambiguous situation. For example, there has been in the past year a certain expansion of cultural exchange between the USSR and Israel, chiefly in the musical field. Artists and other cultural representatives of each country have been ecstatically received in the host country. This is, of course, arranged through Soviet government channels, which means that the authorities knowingly permit the Soviet public, and especially the Soviet Jewish audience, to warm itself in the glow of these expanded contacts.

The Moscow weekly, *New Times* (which is published in English and other European languages, as well as Russian), published a lengthy paraphrase of a letter to the editor on November 15, 1965, from one Mordechai Kaspi, then the Moscow correspondent for the Israeli Communist paper, *Kol HaAm.* The letter takes strong exception to an article attacking Israel which had appeared in an earlier issue of the paper. The letter goes on to point out that it is wrong and unjust to portray Israel in black color, for Israel also has a proletariat, a Communist Party and other "progressive" forces. Beyond that, the letter insists that Israel has as much right to the waters of the Jordan River as do the Arab states. What is most remarkable about this publication is not only that Kaspi's pro-Israel views were published, but that the editor concluded with the following unprecedented remark: "We publish these comments

of an Israeli Communist journalist in the belief that they will give our readers a more rounded and objective picture of Arab-Israel relations."

Maneuvers at the UN

These developments are balanced by others. One such, perhaps not exclusively related to Israel, occurred at the United Nations General Assembly in late October 1965. The Assembly's Third Committee, considering a draft "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination," was presented with a new draft article proposed by the United States and Brazil, to "condemn anti-Semitism and take appropriate action for its eradication. . . . " To counter this proposal, the Soviet delegation suggested an amendment which read as follows:

> States Parties condemn anti-Semitism, Zionism, Nazism, neo-Nazism and all other forms of the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness, and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those misanthropic [subsequently changed to "inhuman"] ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

Knowing that there was strong sentiment in the Third Committee against concrete specifications of racial hatred, the Soviet Mission deliberately injected this *reductio ad absurdum* of specific condemnations as a diversion aimed at defeating the American proposal on anti-Semitism. The idea was to exasperate the majority so as to move it to react precisely as it finally did: by an overwhelming vote, the Committee passed a resolution eliminating all specifications of racial hatred, thus, in effect, killing the U. S. proposal. The unmistakable reason for this Soviet maneuver was the powerful apprehension that the incorporation of such an article into the Convention would provide a permanent world platform for the airing of Soviet policy toward the Jews. Rather than allow that, the Soviets created a new amalgam, Zionism-Nazism, and equated it with other forms of "hatred, misanthropy and inhumanity."

This development evoked a torrent of condemnation all over the world, not least in the Communist movement in the West. Even if the ferment inside many Western Communist Parties does not surface, it is nevertheless churning down below. A symptom is the blast issued by *Combat,* an influential left-wing French journal. Not less significant is the traumatized reaction of the Jewish Communists (who have close ties with the general Communist movement) in Tel Aviv, Paris, Toronto and New York. The pro-Soviet Yiddish-language daily *Morgen Freheit* in New York called the Soviet amalgam "monstrous."

Far more ominous is the fact that in mid-1966 the Soviets expelled an Israeli diplomat on trumped-up charges of "spreading anti-Soviet propaganda" among synagogue Jews—and that the visit of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, already once postponed early in the year, was cancelled indefinitely on the spurious basis that Israel is mounting a "campaign of lies surrounding the question of Soviet Jewry." These serious political steps, moreover, were taken in the midst of a virulent campaign in the Soviet press and at the United Nations in late 1966, in which Israel is portrayed as a vicious aggressor and imperialist tool against innocent Syria and other Arab countries. The intemperateness of this anti-Israel propaganda campaign has rarely been equalled in Soviet annals.

Hopes Raised, Hopes Unrealized

The professional Jewish theatre was once one of the glories of Soviet Jewish life and of Soviet artistic life in general. The last of these professional institutions, the great Jewish State Theatre of Moscow, was liquidated by Stalin in January 1949. In the past decade, all that has been permitted the Jews is an amateur group in Vilna and about a dozen isolated professional performers who travel about the country giving variety performances. The Vilna group is a popular and proficient troupe of amateur dramatic, dance and choral performers who produce serious shows in their off-hours. It has now been given the official designation of "People's Theatre" by the Lithuanian authorities. This honor reflects its recognition as the highest form of amateur group, but does not signify its transformation into a professional theatre.

Soviet apologists have attempted to make much of this development; unhappily, the effort only serves to underscore the pathetic contrast between an amateur group, or isolated individual professionals, and the cultural-communal institution of a State-sponsored professional theatre.

Two events of 1965 raised hopes of a public and authoritative condemnation of anti-Semitism. Soviet ideology is, of course, opposed to anti-Semitism and there is a law on the books punishing incitement based on religious, national or racial grounds. In the 1920s this law was used to punish overt anti-Semitic acts, and anti-Semitism was actively condemned by Soviet leaders, from Lenin on down. But there has been silence and inaction on this for many decades.

On July 19, 1965, Premier Kosygin injected a startling remark into an address at Riga commemorating the 25th anniversary of Latvia's accession to the USSR. He said that "nationalism, Great Power chauvinism, racism and anti-Semitism . . . are completely alien to our society . . . and contradict our *Weltanschauung.*" That was all; nothing of a similar nature preceded or followed it in that speech. It was indeed the first time in decades that a high Soviet leader had said such a thing to a home audience.

On September 5, 1965, *Pravda,* in an otherwise routine front-page editorial on the "friendship of peoples" in the USSR, introduced a very important statement on anti-Semitism, thus retrospectively lending greater significance to Kosygin's July remark. The Pravda statement is worth quoting at length. After a good many paragraphs of a cut-and-dried sort, the editorial states.

> It must likewise not be forgotten that the people of the whole world, and particularly the peoples who have freed themselves from imperialist oppression, look upon the Soviet Union, the world's first country of socialism, and on the relations that have taken shape among the peoples of our country as a model. This means that strengthening the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR is a most important international obligation of each Soviet Republic.
>
> Realizing the revolutionizing significance that the friendship of the peoples of the first country of socialism has, the imperialists outdo themselves to slander it. They do not cease their attempts to revive national discord among our peoples. Vain efforts! Nevertheless, we must keep them in mind and in conducting our ideological work we must remember who could benefit by any manifestations whatsoever of nationalist survivals and friction.
>
> V. I. Lenin, the great creator of the Communist Party and founder of the Soviet State, bade our Party hold sacred the friendship of peoples of the USSR. He wrathfully assailed any manifestations of nationalism whatsoever, and in particular he demanded an unceasing "struggle against anti-Semitism, that foul fanning of racial specialness and national enmity" created by the exploiting classes.

This is unquestionably a remarkable statement. First, it admits, in effect, that anti-Semitism still exists on Soviet soil. The only concrete instance it cites of "survivals" of "national discord" and "friction" is anti-Semitism. *Pravda's* admission takes on even greater importance in that its mention of this form of "manifestation . . . of national enmity" is lent the weighty authority of Lenin himself.

Second, its condemnation of anti-Semitism—unquestionably clear in and of itself—is nevertheless not principled or based on morality, but primarily argued on tactical and strategic grounds. Two such grounds are provided: The first is that the strengthening of the "friendship of peoples" inside the USSR is an "international obligation"—for the peoples of the world regard the USSR as a model; the other is that manifestations of anti-Semitism at home will only help the imperialists in their energetic effort to blacken the Soviet image abroad. Both add up to this adjuration: *The world is watching us!* Finally, the importance of this editorial is enhanced by the fact that it was reprinted in the central newspapers of a number of Soviet republics (as was the Kosygin speech in July).

Soviet Jews doubtless felt some relief at these developments, but unfortunately those two steps were not followed up and no concerted nationwide educational campaign to eradicate anti-Semitism has been undertaken.

Soviet Jews doubtless felt some relief at these developments, but unfortunately those two steps were not followed up and no concerted nationwide educational campaign to eradicate anti-Semitism has been undertaken.

In any event, *Pravda* itself makes it quite clear that this singular move is an extraordinary reflection of and reaction to the pressure of world opinion—and of the world's expectations of Soviet society. Indeed, all the small shifts, concessions and promises reveal a Soviet leadership that is sensitive and troubled. Moscow *is* vulnerable on this issue; it *is* susceptible to the pressure of world opinion; it *does* move in response to it. There is even some reason to suspect that there are elements in the Party and Government, and certainly in influential sectors of the intelligentsia, which are unhappy about Soviet policy toward the Jews.

What Must Be Done

All those elements will be expecting far more, however, than even a full-scale educational campaign against anti-Semitism, invaluable as that in itself would be. They will expect, not token concessions or small shifts and vague promises, but a systematic reversal of the policy of forcible assimilation. They will expect the State-supported establishment, as is the case with all other such groups, of a network of communal institutions—schools, textbooks, rabbinical seminary, teachers institutes, centers of advanced learning, research institutes, courses and classes in Yiddish, Hebrew and Russian for the study of Jewish history, literature and values, a publishing house, a professional theatre, newspapers and journals, a nationwide religious center.

In short, civilized world opinion, and the best elements of the USSR, will expect of a Soviet society that is gradually evolving along more rational lines—the eradication of the irrational factors that have hitherto determined policy toward the Jews, and the establishment of the communal institutions necessary to assure the continuity of Soviet Jewry.

Humane opinion will also expect action on a great humanitarian principle—reunion of broken families—which the USSR has accepted theoretically, so that scores of thousands of Soviet Jews, torn from their shattered families by the traumatic events of the 20th century (mass migration of peoples, two World Wars, the Nazi holocaust), will be able to leave the Soviet Union to rejoin their families in Israel, the United States and elsewhere.

These three steps together would assure Soviet Jews of self-realization as Jews, as citizens and as human beings.

Passover and Matzoth: A Case History of Soviet Policy

A CAREFUL EXAMINATION OF SOVIET POLICY ON THE Festival of Passover is valuable both for the sake of the historical record and for what it reveals about overall Soviet strategy toward the Jews as a group.

As it evolved over the past decade, that policy emerged as a process of encroachment composed of several elements—the ban on the public baking and sale of *matzoth* (the unleavened bread indispensable to the observance of Passover), the concomitant propaganda campaign that harped on themes of anti-Semitism and political subversion, and, finally, the constriction of the scope of the holiday from the broadly historical to the narrowly ritualistic.

This policy of attrition had a multiple impact: It deprived hosts of Soviet Jews of *matzoth*. It made it impossible for religious Jews to observe the holiday properly. It created a miasma of fear among the synagogue Jews. And it established an atmosphere of intimidation against large numbers of non-religious Jews who would otherwise have celebrated the Festival in some significant way.

Having accomplished this much, the authorities seem now to have embarked on a new, more refined course of deprivation. The events of the past year suggest the emergence of a paradox: a new form of attrition characterized by the apparent gradual reversal of the ban on *matzoh*-baking in the synagogue. For, on an extremely limited scale last year and in a slightly more expanded form this year, a number of synagogues in various cities have quietly been permitted to resume the provision of *matzoth* to their parishioners.

The paradox is only superficial, however. This new turn may well reflect a certain decision very likely stimulated by the pressure of world opinion, taken tentatively last year and now carried forward somewhat more confidently: to tolerate the baking and sale of *matzoth* only on synagogue premises, and to maintain the prohibition for public bakeries. At a stroke, this move would accomplish three ends: It lets the old synagogue Jews have their piece of bread, so to speak. It serves to stifle or blunt the worldwide protest against the *matzoh* ban. And it effectively deprives the great mass of Jews and particularly the new generation of young unsynagogued Jews of the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the Festival.

The Soviet treatment of Passover and *matzoh* baking must be understood in the context of the overall official attempt to destroy the bonds between Soviet Jewry and the traditional wellsprings of Jewish life, which have a national-historical, as well as religious, significance.

The Real Soviet Objective

Passover, uniquely among Jewish traditional festivals, represents a cluster of values which Moscow views as inimical. For Passover represents and commemorates the liberation of the Hebrews from Egyptian slavery, the molding of the Jews into a nation, the unbroken continuity of Jewish history from the Exodus onward, the persistence of the Jewish historical memory, the sense of kinship with all Jews past and present, the embodiment of that kinship in the family around which the gala celebration of the Passover feast centers and which even non-religious Jews join in joyously. These values together make Passover the most important link, as it were, between the Jewish past and the Jewish present. For it represents, more clearly than any other holiday, the perpetuation of Jewish historical consciousness and the sense of Jewish identity.

Since it is precisely the Soviet objective to eradicate that consciousness and that identity, to shatter and pulverize the bonds of Soviet Jews with their history and their people—Soviet policy has fixed on the Passover as perhaps the key target of a process of attrition. The very consumption of *matzoth* has been transformed, in the process, from a basic historic symbol for the entire Jewish people into a ritual food of a religious cult.

Certainly Passover is a religious holiday—but it is not only that. And certainly *matzoh* is a religious food—but it is not only that. For large numbers of non-religious Jews, in the USSR as in the United States, enjoy this festival because they feel some kind of kinship with Jewish historical, moral, cultural and family values. For them, Passover stands for the historic freedom of the Jewish people—and it celebrates and exalts the spirit of freedom for all men. For non-religious as well as religious Jews, the eating of *matzoth*, especially at the *Seder* table, is the tangible way by which they can symbolize that commemoration, that celebration, that exaltation. It is how they symbolize their historic sense of Jewish kinship and of Jewish cultural and spiritual values.

To transform this holiday into a narrowly religious rite observed only by religious Jews means, in the Soviet context, to relegate the observance of Passover and the consumption of *mazoth* to the level of super-

stition—and to barely tolerate them impatiently while awaiting their disappearance along with the older generation of believing Jews.

This can only result in depriving the masses of non-religious younger Soviet Jews, increasingly aware of their Jewishness, of the opportunity to perpetuate and enrich their historic Jewish bonds. Such Jews would not think twice about buying *matzoth* at public stores and bakeries. But they would surely boggle at exchanging flour and rubles for *matzoth* at the synagogues. A Jew who is a member of the Communist Party or the Komsomol, or who is a government or public official, or is a student or an employee seeking advancement, will keep an absolute distance—for fear of censure, punishment, or retardation of career.

This is nothing if not a subtle means of forcing young Soviet Jews away from even a secularized version of their heritage. In short—forced assimilation.

Against this theoretical backdrop, it becomes possible to evaluate the Soviet policy on Passover and *matzoth* in a meaningful way.

History of Restrictions

The history of the prohibition on *matzoh* baking in the Soviet Union is instructive. It reveals a gradual process of official encroachment on this key religious practice and national tradition.

In the past, two methods had been used for the public baking of *matzoth* for Passover. In Moscow, for example, a State bakery used to be specifically set aside for this purpose a few months prior to the holiday. In other places, where baking facilities exist in the synagogue compounds—as in Leningrad, Riga, Tbilisi (Georgia) and Kulashi (Georgia)—the *matzoth* had been baked there with flour allotted by the State, and by workers sent by the appropriate State institution.

The ban, as it developed, affected both of these methods. Like an ever-tightening noose, it began in outlying cities and towns as early as 1957, and by 1961 it had gradually come to encompass all but Moscow.

The first restrictions on the baking of *matzoh* can be traced back to 1957, when the authorities refused to issue permits to the Jewish community of Kharkov, which numbers about 70,000 Jews. In 1958, *matzoh* baking was discontinued in those areas where existing Jewish religious congregations were not officially registered—or where, if they had been registered until then, they were dispersed by the authorities during that year. For example: the communities in Shaulai, Lutsk, Khabarovsk, Kolomea, Stalino, Brest, Yakutsk. In 1959, the ban was extended to places where registered Jewish religious congregations still existed. For example: Zaporozhe, Rovno, Uzhgorod, Bobruisk, Gomel, Kuibyshev, Rostov, Saratov, Stalingrad.

It may be assumed, however, that at that time the Soviet authorities were still guided in the enforcement of the ban by the strength of the reaction in each individual community. Thus, though the ban in 1959 was extended to Odessa, permits *were* issued to the communities in Zhmerinka, Berdichev, and Lvov. In 1959, also, Jewish communities were still permitted to receive *matzoh* parcels from abroad.

In 1960, the ban spread to the following communities: Belaya Tserkov, Berdichev, Zhmerinka, Lvov, Zhitomer, Smolensk, Chernovtsy, Bendery, Kiev, Kishinev. The extension of the ban to areas open to foreign tourists—such as Kiev, Chernovtsy and Lvov—brought the ban on *matzoh*-baking to the attention of the outside world. In 1962, with its application to Moscow as well, the ban became total. It covered the production and sale and/or distribution of *matzoh* in both State bakeries and synagogues that possessed *matzoh*-baking machinery on their premises.

The West became aware of the spreading restrictions only very gradually. After a few years it became known to limited circles that, for example, Jewish congregations, synagogue leaders and ordinary religious people in such places as Kishinev, Riga, Beltsy, Saratov, and Uzhgorod had been arrested, fined or had special taxes imposed on them for engaging in the "illegal production" of *matzoh*, or for "speculating" and "profiteering" from its sale. But it was only the announcement a few weeks before Passover 1962 by Rabbi Yehudah Leib Levin, of the Moscow Great Synagogue, that Moscow's Jews were also to be deprived of *matzoh*—that made Jewish communities abroad, and to a certain extent world opinion, aware of the nature and scope of the countrywide ban.

For the first time in Soviet history—including even the Stalin period—the ban on organized *matzoh* baking covered the entire country, including Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Bielorussia, the Caucauses and Central Asia.

Evasive Explanations

The record of Soviet prevarication and evasion when confronted with protests on this policy is illuminating.

When the first reports began to circulate, early in 1962, that no *matzoh* would be baked in Moscow, official spokesmen angrily denied the reports, calling them anti-Soviet lies aimed at exacerbating the cold war. By March 1962, however, Rabbi Levin had to announce that the machines in the State bakery which made the *matzoth* had broken down; the required repairs, it was vaguely intimated, might even be completed in time for that very Passover. No such "repairs" were ever made, and the good rabbi had to urge his flock to do without matzoth, and to make do with peas instead. As late as January 1963—more

than half a year after Passover—Novosti Press Agency, one of whose main tasks is to disseminate propaganda abroad about Soviet Jewry, was still imputing the machinery-breakdown "explanation" to Rabbi Levin.

Just prior to Passover 1963, and for more than a year thereafter, a new explanation was given: It is unconstitutional and illegal for State bakeries to bake *matzoth* and for State stores to sell them, because *matzoth* are a religious article—and the USSR adheres strictly to the separation of Church and State.

This of course failed to explain why *matzoth* had been baked and sold in State bakeries *prior* to 1962. It was, moreover, contradicted by an official Soviet document submitted to the United Nations on July 11, 1956, which stated:

> By order of the USSR Government, on days preceding particularly important holidays—such as Passover in the case of the Jews—the shops of the State trading organizations sell special types of bakery products, *matzoth* for Orthodox Jews, etc., to enable worshippers to perform the appropriate ritual.

Kulichi *and* Matzoth

Just to prove that no anti-Jewish discrimination was intended, Soviet spokesmen pointed out that State bakeries also no longer produced *kulichi,* the communion cakes used by the Russian Orthodox at Easter.

The analogy with *kulichi* is misleading and defective in several respects. In the first place, though both are symbolic wafers used for religious purposes, the analogy ends there. For *matzoh* is in addition, for Soviet religious Jews, perhaps the basic food they eat for the entire eight-day period of the Passover. In general, under Soviet conditions, the bread product is the basic element in the diet, and *matzoh* is the Passover bread for the religious Jew. Thus, in being deprived of *matzoh,* the Soviet religious Jew is deprived not only of a symbol, but of a basic food and, not least, of a fundamental *religious food. Kulichi* are clearly not comparable items.

But even if they were, the analogy is defective on other grounds, which point to the uniquely weak and isolated situation of Jewish congregations in the USSR. The Russian Orthodox Church, for all that it is, like other religions, subjected to official anti-religious propaganda assaults and practical curbs, is a large, extensive, tightly organized and powerful nationwide structure—in many ways favored by the regime. It is in fact through its nationwide organization that it undertakes and supervises a wide range of activities aimed at providing the wants of communicants. And among its varied institutions are not only churches but monasteries, academies and seminaries, all with cooking and baking facilities—which can and do produce *kulichi* in adequate supply for their *symbolic* use.

The provision of an adequate supply for *matzoh* in the USSR requires a major enterprise. If the State bakeries are withdrawn from this production, Soviet Jews have no institutions comparable to those of Russian Orthodoxy to supply their needs. Each synagogue is literally on its own. Even those synagogues that own the appropriate machinery cannot guarantee to produce enough for their own needs, let alone those of neighboring communities that lack such machinery. And those—the large majority—without such facilities have literally nowhere to turn.

(After the institution of the ban in 1957, and until it blanketed the country in 1962, poignant stories emerged from the USSR telling of bold, venturesome Jews who dared to travel such long distances as from Rostov to Tbilisi, or from Bielorussia and the Ukraine to Tashkent, to obtain *matzoh* from those synagogues still permitted to bake on their own premises. And such journeys were also branded as illicit by the Soviet press.)

The Private Baking Program

For Passover 1963 Rabbi Levin was authorized to announce to his flock that they should freely bake *matzoh* in their own homes. He was even encouraged to state, before and during Passover, that this do-it-yourself program was providing more than enough *matzoh* for those who needed it. At the same time, he proclaimed an official rabbinical easement, permitting religious Jews to eat certain items, such as peas and rice, which are normally forbidden on Passover, but which would have to suffice in the absence of *matzoh* —a sad commentary on the officially announced adequacy of home-baked *matzoh* supplies.

This private baking program was tragic in other respects. To begin with, *matzoh* cannot be baked in just any oven. Certainly, strictly religious Jews would not likely find it acceptable. But even if they did, under duress, current Soviet living conditions make it virtually impossible for most people to do so. Housing conditions still require most Soviet citizens to share an apartment, or at least the kitchen and oven, with several families. In such circumstances, baking *matzoh* at home becomes for most people either a physical hardship or a source of social awkwardness, or both.

But, technical difficulties aside, there exists in the USSR a general climate of official disapproval of private *matzoh* baking. Again and again, private *matzoh* baking has been exposed and branded over the years in the Soviet press as "illegal production." The "speculative" character of its sale has been underscored. The authorities have even taken stringent measures against individuals who have baked *matzoth* privately, by imposing heavy fines and even arresting some of them—as, for instance, in such communities as Beltsy, Saratov, Uzhgorod, Riga.

The simple fact is that, in the last few years, this dispensation did not work and most Jews went with-

out *matzoth,* or had only some tokens. The authorities did, however, allow the delivery of several thousand parcels of *matzoh* sent to Soviet Jews by their relatives abroad; the permission was not publicized, so that many Jews, who might otherwise have asked their relatives to send *matzoth*, did not know they could. In one instance, a consignment of *matzoth* sent by the Jewish community of Sweden was returned.

Further Evasions

In July 1963, a new climax of prevarication was reached at the trial of four Jews accused of profiteering in the production and sale of *matzoth*. When the news of their arrest first appeared in the Western press, Soviet sources vehemently denied it altogether. But the trial itself showed the value of these denials. At the trial, defense counsel, courageously defending the innocence of their clients, pointed to a serious discrimination: "All churches sell candles and wafers at high prices, and nobody holds them criminally responsible."

Indeed, if Soviet Jewry were permitted the kind of nationwide organization or representative body allowed the Russian Orthodox, the Baptists and the Moslems, among others, they would have the authorized legal instrumentality by which their sacramental foods and other religious articles would be provided. The absence of such an authorized instrumentality inevitably leads to the creation of an artificial scarcity in Jewish religious articles. It also forces those Jews committed and courageous enough to seek to supply such articles as *matzoh* (and religious calendars, etc.) into the position of involuntary lawbreakers.

At the trial, still more official prevarications emerged. Rabbi Levin was called as a witness for the prosecution—but the import of his testimony was clearly for the defense. Among other things, he testified to a statement made to him by a certain Andreyev, an official of the Committee for the Affairs of Religious Cults:

> "Unfortunately," said Andreyev, "this State cannot provide you with *matzoth* at the moment, because it has neither place nor equipment for it. . . . "

Was this conceivable or credible in so advanced an economy—especially since *until 1962* the State had found no difficulty in providing place and equipment?

A year later, just before Passover 1964, still another new "explanation" was offered, this time by Mr. Leonid A. Gouliev of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. In an interview with Jewish students on March 2, 1964, Mr. Gouliev said:

> Until 1961 the State baked *matzoh* in State bakeries. But because it was not prepared in a *kosher* manner, the Jewish population would not buy it. In addition, other nationalities began to demand that their traditional foods be prepared. Since this would have been impractical, the production of all religious food was stopped. . . . This past week the government decided to resume baking *matzoh* because they realize how difficult it is for small communities to make *matzoh* on their own.

This was a truly extraordinary statement. It was of course untrue that the Jews did not in years past buy *matzoth* in the State bakeries; they did, in vast numbers—including non-religious Jews. The injection of the newly discovered "demand" of the other nationalities for their own traditional foods is a transparent diversion. The other nationalities never lacked facilities to produce their own foods.

Beyond this, Mr. Gouliev's statement no longer contained, strangely enough, the traditional insistence on the principle of separation of Church and State; it had now become merely "impractical" for the State to produce religious foods. And so, despite the vaunted principle of separation, he announced the government's resumption of *matzoh* baking—out of ostensible consideration for small, outlying Jewish communities.

Cat-and-Mouse Game

The Government did *not,* in fact, resume the baking of *matzoth* in 1964. Rather, a mere handful of congregations, chiefly in Georgia, with baking facilities on the synagogue premises, were permitted to resume their own baking there. And as a result of the increased pressure of world public opinion, the Moscow Great Synagogue was ostensibly given permission to make special arrangements for *matzoh* baking, at a house some distance from the city. The baking there was stopped almost as soon as it started, on some technical or "sanitary" pretext—after the baking facilities and process were duly photographed by Novosti specialists.

At the same time, Rabbi Levin was authorized to request rabbis and rabbinical organizations abroad to ship *matzoh* parcels urgently, so that they might arrive in time for Passover. Jewish communities in the United States, England, and Israel responded, but were nevertheless unable to provide more than a fraction of what was needed.

The shipments had been addressed to the synagogue in Moscow and Leningrad, and similarly to all other towns where houses of prayer were known still to exist. The security organs, however, forced the Jews to return the *matzoth* and to attach to the returned parcels letters in which the shipments were described as "provocations" and "pressures."

On the very eve of Passover 1964, it was ascertained that the authorities had allowed just 204 parcels to enter Moscow only, and that these parcels were but a small part of the shipment from London to Rabbi Levin. All the other *matzoh* shipments sent to all other Jewish communities throughout the USSR

were either returned or impounded, though customs duty had already been pre-paid.

Thus was a cruel cat-and-mouse game played with the needs and sensibilities of Soviet Jews.

Arousing Prejudice

For years, a virulent propaganda campaign was conducted against Passover and *matzoth*. It employed the crudest forms of traditional anti-Semitic stereotyping. It charged the Soviet atmosphere with ominous doubts about the loyalty of the Jews. And the very ideological nature of the propaganda assault revealed the central symbolic role which Passover plays in the Soviet policy of attrition of Jewish identity

The articles appeared in a variety of languages in cities all over the country—in Russian, Bielorussian, Ukrainian, Moldavian; in Moscow, Tallinn, Kiev, Zhitomer, Minsk, Alma Ata. No major city and no major language was excepted—especially in those areas of sizable Jewish population, in those areas of pervasive and endemic anti-Semitism. The assault went beyond the usual ridicule, derision and contempt poured out on religious beliefs and practices. It reached to and stirred up ancient hatreds.

1. Passover and the Golden Calf. In the case of the baking of *matzoth,* the traditional anti-Semitic stereotype of inextricable connection between Jews and money was a constant and central theme. Here are some choice quotations:

> For these "saints" nothing is holy! But there is one thing they consider holy: Money, money, money. . . . And the flow comes through into the pockets of the parasites of the Jewish synagogue of Alma Ata. The camera has preserved the picture of the servitors of the synagogue doing a "sacred" deed—the lively activity of making *matzoh.*

> Money—this is their ideal. . . . This spring, Fanya Weisman and Sioma Weiner began to bake *matzoh.* Were they motivated by religious feelings? Oh no! They wanted to profit from the belivers.

> . . . Stuffing themselves with *matzoth* and *ethrogim,* the preachers of Judaism—Spector, Kotlaryevsky, Shuchat and Monastryrsky—pray only to the golden calf: how to collect more money from the believers for their own needs and for the militant spirit of the Israeli militarists.

> The gods of the servitors of the synagogue are profit and money—"the golden calf."

That phrase—"worshippers of the golden calf"—was the sinister key to the Soviet portrayal of the image of the Jew. On the one hand, as we have just seen, it was constantly used in the atheist propoganda directed against Judaism. At the same time, it was a recurring theme in the enormous press campaign conducted from 1961 to 1964 against economic crime. (In that campaign, incidentally, nearly fifty-five per cent of all those sentenced to death for such alleged crimes were Jews: a grossly disproportionate number, protested the world over as evidence of anti-Jewish scapegoating.)

This odious phrase was never used against non-Jews. But it became the standard journalistic mode for anti-Jewish assaults in the Soviet press. It conjured up, in the minds of large masses of Soviet people not far removed from traditional illiteracy and superstition, the hoary image of the Jew and money, perpetuated through the long, dark centuries of anti-Semitic persecution, until our own day.

2. Passover and Political Disloyalty. Even more ominous, however, was the associated theme of ideological subversion and political disloyalty directed against Judaism generally, and against the Passover most specifically.

In 1954, the Soviet Communist Party declared: "It is especially stupid to put Soviet citizens under political suspicion because of their religious convictions." And yet, this is precisely what has been done for years concerning Jews and Judaism—with special reference to Passover. It might well be said that this "special treatment" of Passover is a "special privilege" of anti-Semites in the Ukraine, Bielorussia and Moldavia—three hotbeds of anti-Jewish prejudice.

In the Ukraine, a "scholar" like Karl Y. Yampolsky could write: ". . . The chauvinist Passover slogans stand in direct contradiction to the feelings of Soviet patriotism and boundless love for the Socialist motherland." (From: "The Origin and Class Essence of Jewish Rituals and Holidays," issued by the Society for the Diffusion of Political and Scientific Knowledge of the Ukrainian SSR, Kiev, 1961.)

Also in the Ukraine, another "scholar," by the name of T. K. Kichko, wrote:

> Under modern conditions, the Passover holiday harms us in a great number of ways, through engendering disrespect for work and fostering elements of nationalism among the Jewish workers. In celebrating the Passover, the believers do not go to work for several days; thus they hinder production plans and violate work discipline.
>
> The celebration of the Passover is especially harmful because the entire Passover legend, all the prayers, orient the believing Jews toward returning to Israel, which is now the center of Judaism and Zionism. The Passover prayers urge the believing Jews: "May God grant that we meet in Jerusalem next year." Invitations summon the Jews to move to Israel, where they —free workers of our country—will become cannon fodder for Ben-Gurion's clique and for his imperialistic masters.
>
> (From: *Judaism Without Embellishment,* published by the Ukrainian Academy of Science, Kiev, 1963.)

Though this book was half-heartedly criticized by Soviet sources, neither Kichko, nor the editors of the book, nor its academic sponsors have ever been punished by the terms of Soviet and Ukrainian law.

In Moldavia, another Soviet "specialist on the Jews," F. S. Mayatsky, could write:

> The peculiar characteristic of most Jewish holidays is their clear expression of nationalism. Such festivals as Passover, for example, give rise to nationalist feelings, and poison the minds of Jews by diverting their thoughts to Israel, "the land of their fathers". . . . Judaism kills love for the Soviet motherland. . . .
>
> (From: *Sovietskaya Moldavia,* official daily government newspaper in Kishinev, capital of Moldavia, July 23 1959.)

This same Mayatsky was the author of a vile anti-Semitic tract in 1964, also published in Kishinev. In the latter, he did not repeat the above phrases in so many words. But it is quite clear that he learned nothing between 1959 and 1964, for he continued to communicate his old views in other ways.

In one or another form he repeated the idea that Judaism, Zionism, Israel and the Jewish sense of peoplehood are all evil things in the Soviet lexicon: chauvinist, nationalist, anti-people, alien to the Soviet spirit. This is, after all, the heart of the case against Passover—that it incorporates a spirit alien to the Soviets.

Though Mayatsky's book was criticized by Communists *outside* the USSR (in the United States and Italy), it has never been censured or withdrawn at home, Mayatsky himself has never been punished—and his tract still circulates freely in Moldavia.

3. The 1964 Propaganda Assault. This vitriolic campaign reached its zenith in time for Passover 1964—in a nationally coordinated and concerted fashion.

On March 17, *Pravda Vostoka* (in Tashkent, Uzbek SSR) violently attacked the shipment of *matzoth* from abroad as "ideological sabotage" and "ideological subversion." It demanded that Jews should forthwith return any such parcels received. And it reported a series of protest meetings in Uzbekistan, at which some Jews were trotted out on stage to urge other Jews to protest the shipments.

On March 21, this article was reprinted in *Izvestia,* the Government's central daily paper published in Moscow and distributed nationally. This gave the entire country to understand precisely where the Soviet Government stood.

On March 22, *Sovietskaya Bielorussia* (Minsk, Bielorussian SSR) lashed out in similar terms, also publishing letters of protest against the *matzoh* shipments—letters osensibly volunteered by Jewish readers.

On March 23, *Moldova Sochialiste,* a Moldavian-language paper in Kishinev, published an article on "The Essence of the Jewish Passover," in which the sentiment is expressed that this holiday *"undermines the noble feelings of Soviet patriotism."*

On March 24, *Vicherny Leningrad,* the popular afternoon daily in the USSR's second city, described the *matzoh* shipments as a "provocation," an "offense," and "gross interference in our internal affairs." In its view, these shipments were anti-Soviet acts, made "in order to trigger off nationalistic and Zionist sentiments."

On March 25, the distant Siberian Jewish paper, *Birobidjaner Shtern,* otherwise utterly removed from Jewish life and from Jewish values and interests, also found it necessary to publish a similar article.

On March 26, *Sovietskaya Moldavia* (Kishinev, Moldavian SSR) followed suit.

On March 27, *Sovietskaya Latvia* (Riga, Estonian SSR) published an article in the same spirit, ostensibly volunteered by Tabakman, the chairman of the Riga congregation!

On March 28, *Vichirny Kiiv,* a Ukranian-language paper in Kiev, published a letter from a Jewish pensioner who is made to reject the parcel with the following words: "This gift has simply insulted me; it has debased my dignity as a human being."

On March 28, *Znamia Kommunizma* (Odessa, Ukrainian SSR), also published a lengthy rejection of the parcels: "We know that *matzoh* is not quite as innocent a thing as some people might think. It is, first of all, a means of propagating the Jewish religion. . . . You rabid defenders of Judaism are kindling unbridled Zionist-chauvinist propaganda around the *matzoh* that you send to Jews with a provocative, anti-Soviet purpose."

Though this kind of massive propaganda assault did not carry over to Passover 1965, it found its echo in a notorious article published February 2, 1965 in *Zviazda,* the leading Bielorussian-language paper of Minsk, capital of the Bielorussian SSR. The article was written by still another of the long line of Soviet "scholars" and "experts" on Jews and Judaism, one J. Muraviev. Its very title gives away its intent: "The Shadow of the Synagogue."

One of its many choice items is the following:

> Jewish bourgeois organizations are doing their utmost to revive Judaism in our circumstances. Many Israeli tourists disseminate Zionist literature. Every year the Minsk synagogue receives *matzoh* packages from abroad. But the matter doesn't stop at these "gifts" alone. Judaism is trying to create an ideological diversion, to fill the consciousness of working Jews in our country with the poison of bourgeois ideology.

Thus Passover plays a very special role in an ominous propaganda campaign in which Judaism and the Jewish people are linked with a doctrine and a movement, Zionism, which the Soviets consider subversive—and with a state, Israel, which they consider the agent of imperialism in the Middle East.

It is only against Jews and Judaism that such ominous political suspicion has been raised in Soviet propaganda, and such themes as ideological subversion, lack of patriotism and disloyalty exploited. Even a non-religious Jew would be offended and perhaps even intimidated. Indeed, this is precisely what is involved in the process of attrition against Passover and

matzoth—to atomize Soviet Jewry. For the objective of the policy is to erode the Jewish spirit and to eradicate Jewish values.

Undoubtedly as a result of consistent, systematic world-wide protests—including many from Western Communist parties—a certain shift of emphasis in the policy became discernible last year and has apparently continued into this year. The virulence of the propaganda, for one thing, has substantially abated. For another, the number of synagogues being permitted to produce *matzoth* has very gradually grown. Last year, *matzoth* were baked by congregations in Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa, Kishinev, Tbilisi and certain Central Asian towns, and this year probably in even more.

But it must be noted that this shift is seriously defective in three major respects. First, the lifting of the ban on *matzoh*-baking is far from being nation-wide, so that a large number of Jews—perhaps the majority —are unaffected by the glacier-like forward movement. Second, *matzoh*-production is restricted to the synagogues, thus depriving the great number of unreligious and younger generation Jews of any tangible means of observing the holiday. Third, even in the synagogues the procedure for obtaining *matzoth* is inefficient and even demeaning. All told, then, the situation is far removed from the *status quo ante* 1957, when *matzoth* were freely available in bakeries throughout the country.

A word about the procedure for obtaining *matzoth*. To do so, Jews must bring flour to the synagogue. Flour is not the easiest thing to get in the Soviet Union. Moreover, the finished product is very expensive. Above all, when bringing the flour to the synagogue, Jews must register their identity, in order to place their *matzoh* request in advance. In a situation where the security police still plays a substantial role, especially in the affairs of the synagogues, this procedure can only arouse apprehensions. Although it may be perfectly safe for the registrants now, the fact is that their names are known to the police—and the future is uncertain.

Thus, the process of attrition against Jewish culture, religion and identity persists. Soviet Jewry represents the last great remnant of a vast East European Jewish community devoured by the Nazi holocaust—the last residue of what was once the matrix of a rich and ancient Jewish heritage, from which sprang all that is best in modern Jewish life everywhere in the world.

The Soviet policy of forcible assimilation, as reflected in the treatment of Passover, conjures up in the minds of Jews the specter of the involuntary loss of this community to the Jewish people and to Jewish historical and cultural values. It is this which is at heart of the Jewish people's anguish over the fate of Soviet Jewry.

The Hunger for Jewish Life

(From the testimony to the Ad Hoc Commission on the Rights of Soviet Jews)

AS A FOREIGNER WHO CAME OFTEN TO PRAY AND TO study in the synagogue, as one who knew the ritual and the curriculum, and as one who used Yiddish and Hebrew with facility and basic Russian in an emergency, I was frequently asked all sorts of questions by Soviet Jews about Jewish life in the United States, Western Europe, and Israel. It was not at all difficult to detect signs of pride and satisfaction when I recounted the developments in *yeshivah* education in Israel and other countries. Even more, there was decided envy when I described the remarkable growth of the *yeshivahs* and the Jewish day schools, as well as the activities of Torah Umesorah—the National Society for Hebrew Day Schools. Many a man sighed and expressed the wish for some religious instruction for their children and grandchildren.

Le me conclude, therefore, with the conviction that the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union has been and still is in a state of persecution. In recent years, both Judaism and those who believe in its doctrines and practice its precepts have been increasingly subjected to ridicule, vilification, and abuse. Religious discrimination continues in full force. The activities of the lone center of Jewish theological education, the Yeshivah Kol Yaakov of Moscow, has been reduced to an extreme minimum. With the intensification of the all-Union campaign for atheistic indoctrination, inaugurated in recent times in 1959, the attacks on Judaism and religious Jews have become virulent. The danger to the Jewish religion and to its practitioners is greater than ever before in the history of the Soviet Union.

We can pray and protest. We can convince ourselves and others that there is in fact religious persecution of Jews in Soviet Russia. We might take comfort, perhaps, in the recollection of the truth uttered about half a century ago by that devout Communist, close friend of Lenin, and first People's Commissar for Education, Anatol Lunacharskii, "Religion is like a nail; the harder you hit it, the deeper it goes into the wood." Let us hope that the wood stays intact.

William Brickman

Nationality, Language and Education

NATIONALITY IS ONE OF THE CENTRAL FACTS OF LIFE in the Soviet Union. This fact is perhaps not readily comprehensible to the American mind, but it must be grasped in order to understand some of the basic realities of Soviet society and of the situation of the Jews in that land.

The difficulty which Americans have in coming to grips with the ethnic-historical-cultural concept of nationality is in no way remarkable—for that concept, and the demographic reality that underlies it, no longer plays a decisive role in American life. Though the United States is a nation of immigrants, or of the children and grandchildren of immigrants, the ethnic, cultural and linguistic differences have long since become attenuated. For whatever cluster of reasons, they have tended to be eroded, blurred or washed away.

While it would not be accurate to say that ethnic origin is no longer an important factor in American social and political life, it becomes less so with each passing day. A case in point: Ethnic jokes—once so rich a source of national humor and thus an important and engaging reflection of a crucial facet of national life—are today scarcely possible, because they have become irrelevant. The languages, accents, intonations and group character out of which the jokes sprang have been obscured and largely submerged. Who makes Irish jokes today, or Italian jokes, or German jokes? Even Jewish jokes have been so transformed in a subtle and sophisticated way, so modernized—so Anglicized and Americanized—that they are barely discernible as such except to an "in" group. They are more clearly recognizable as the humor of middle-class urban society, with only a faint, lingering echo of the specifically Jewish "sound."

In short, the great melting pot has virtually stripped the immigrants or their children of the cultural baggage they brought here—their distinctive languages, folkways, group character, group memory: the elements that go into making up the entity called nationality, leaving only religion as the decisive factor of group distinctiveness.

Not so in the Soviet Union. There, nationality lies at the very heart of identity and identification. If it can be said that Soviet citizenship determines the political context of the individual's life and that Communist Party doctrine shapes its intellectual content, then it is not less true that one's nationality molds the individual's heart and soul. For in the USSR one's nationality largely determines the language one speaks, the history one is proud of, the literature one cherishes, the music one loves, the people one feels most comfortable with. It is a matter of group self-awareness, group memory, group pride—and of the individual's identification with them. These things are preserved and perpetuated through history and heroes, through language, literature and song.

Moreover, one's public definition, as it were, is simply that one is a Soviet citizen of a given nationality—be it Russian, Ukrainian, Georgian, Armenian, Lithuanian, Uzbek . . . or Jewish. Law, history and society identify the individual thus, and thus he finds his identity. So it is neither accidental nor trivial that one's nationality is among the handful of vital statistics listed on every citizen's "internal passport"—the identity card must be shown in all key transactions involving such fundamental aspects of life as education, employment, security, travel.

Encouraging National Pride

It is, finally, not too much to say that the individual's dignity is bound up with the pride he takes as a member of a nationality. And, in fact, the authorities positively encourage him to take such pride, just as they encourage all the many nationalities that inhabit Soviet territory to perpetuate and enhance their national-cultural existence. Indeed, one of the proudest boasts of the Soviets is that nearly half a century of Communist rule has transformed a country which under Tsarism was known as a prison-house of nations into a place where the friendship of peoples prevails and all the nationalities thrive.

True, a state of tension exists, triangularly, between the Communist ideologues who anticipate that the achievement of full Communism will signify also the complete elimination of all national cultural and linguistic distinctions, the Great Russian chauvinists who believe that the sole language and culture of the one Soviet civilization which full Communism will usher in should be Russian—and the masses of the various nationalities who cling with proud tenacity to their national consciousness, language and culture. But the increasingly realistic and pragmatic Soviet authorities recognize, in effect, that the objective of one Soviet language and culture is quite utopian, while at the same time they manage to keep a tight rein on their Russian chauvinism by their gradually growing practical acceptance of the legitimacy and durability of the life of the nationalities.

In the USSR as elsewhere, the key to the preservation, perpetuation and enhancement of national cultures is the school—specifically, instruction in the national language, what the Soviets call the mother tongue. The charts that follow provide a graphic demonstration of the vast scope of official encouragement given to the nationalities to use their native

languages (mother tongues) as the languages of instruction in their own schools. These statistics are not easy to come by; there is thus far no central source on languages of instruction in Soviet schools. In consequence, the tables cannot be complete, and in some cases the information is as much as ten years old. What matters, however, is that all the information is consistent and one-directional: it demonstrates the enormous support for nationality education in the national language.

It goes without saying that the fifteen major nationalities which predominate politically as well as culturally in the fifteen constituent (Union) Republics that compose the USSR also dominate the languages of instruction in the schools of their republics. Of vastly greater theoretical, legal and practical significance are two other facts that emerge clearly from the charts: (a) the great attention paid to the educational and linguistic needs of many very tiny, even miniscule, nationalities; and (b) the substantial educational facilities provided for dispersed nationalities who compose national minorities on the territory of other Soviet nationalities.

Both these points are directly relevant to the situation of Soviet Jewry. From virtually the beginning of the Soviet regime, the Jews were formally and officially recognized as a nationality, and in the first two decades of Soviet life they were accorded the cultural institutions and facilities which are the prerogatives of nationalities in the USSR—including schools in their native language. (Hebrew was proscribed for both religious and political reasons, and since Yiddish was the language then spoken by the masses of Soviet Jews it was installed as their official national language and remains so to this day.)

Now while the Jews, with their approximately three millions, are eleventh in numerical size among the scores of Soviet nationalities, they can nevertheless be classified as a small nationality. Morever, they are dispersed throughout the USSR, though the bulk of the Jews are to be found in three republics — the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), the Ukraine and Bielorussia.

The tragic fact is that, unlike many other small and dispersed nationalities, the Jews are uniquely deprived of schools, classes or any other means of using their language for instruction, or of other necessary educational facilities in any language—Yiddish, Hebrew or Russian.

Of all the many large and small nationalities on Soviet soil, the Jews are without doubt the group with the oldest recorded history and the longest tradition of civilization and learning. Yet they are singularly discriminated against and are prohibited from learning anything of that history and civilization, and from studying their language, literature, culture and heritage.

Facts and Figures

Specific attention should be paid to various points that emerge from some of the individual tables:

1) Neither Yiddish nor Hebrew is among the fifty-nine languages of instruction in the USSR as a whole (Table I). Nor has any provision been made for classes, courses, lectures or any other facility for instruction in Jewish history, literature and culture in the Russian language.

2) Neither Yiddish nor Hebrew, nor Russian-language instruction, is among the dozens of languages of instruction for nationalities in the RSFSR (Table II). This, despite the fact that there are about one million Jews in the RSFSR—about half a million in Moscow and about a third of a million in Leningrad.

Tiny nationalities with virtually no history, no literature, no culture, and an alphabet that had to be created for them have schools in their native languages—but the Jews have none. There are schools for a grand total of 12,000 Chukchi or 6,300 Koryaks —but no schools for a million Jews.

3) In Uzbekistan (Table III), tiny minorities like the Kazakhs, Tadjiks, Kirghiz and Turkmens and Karakalpaks use their own tongues as languages of instruction in their own schools. But Jews who are a minority, large or small as the case may be, in many of the republics, can have no Jewish-language school.

4) In the Ukraine (Table IV), three small national minorities each numbering less than 400,000, have schools in their native languages—Moldavians, Hungarians and Poles. But the Jews, who number about one million and who bear an ancient tradition of learning in the Ukraine, have none.

Another fact that points up the tragic educational and cultural discrimination against the Jews: According to the 1959 Soviet census, there are about the same number of Poles and Jews—30,000—in the urban areas of the Region of Lvov. It is generally known, however, that the Poles are dispersed throughout many of the towns and cities of the Region, whereas the Jews are almost entirely concentrated in the Region's main city—the city of Lvov itself. This means that there are undoubtedly considerably fewer Poles than Jews in the city of Lvov. Yet Table IV reveals that there are two Polish schools in Lvov—but none for Jews.

5) Although Table V, for the Kazakh Republic, cites a number of small, even tiny, nationality groups with schools and classes in their own language, it omits all mention of the large number of schools in the German language conducted by and for the scores of thousands of Soviet citizens of German nationality who live in that republic. The omission is probably accounted for by the fact that in the school year of 1958-59 there were few if any German schools yet in existence—since the German nationality, long resident on Russian soil but deported by Stalin in 1941 to

Central Asia, was only then beginning to be rehabilitated culturally. In Kazakhstan, as well as in several other Central Asian republics where large numbers of them live, they are enjoying an officially encouraged gradual renascence of their educational and cultural life.

The tragic historical irony is that the Soviet Germans, like the Jews, dispersed and purged by Stalin, are regaining their schools—but the Jews are not.

6) Certain statistics for the Turkmen Republic (Table VII) demand particular atention. They show that some four thousand Kazakh children were receiving native-language instruction in that republic a few years ago. It seems inconceivable that in scores of major cities in other parts of the USSR where Jews live in large numbers there cannot be found any at all who wish some form of Jewish education.

7) Table VIII provides some important data on educational facilities for the Poles in Lithuania. There are, to be sure, many more Poles than Jews in that republic. Still, the two main cities, Vilna and Kaunas, have substantial Jewish populations (25,000 and 5,000 respectively) who, moreover, are known to maintain the traditions of culture and learning for which those two communities were famous over the centuries. There can be no doubt that, if they were provided with permission and opportunities, the Jews of those two cities would immediately create Yiddish and Hebrew schools (of a secular character), as well as special courses and classes in Russian on Jewish history and culture. Yet they are totally deprived of that permission and those opportunities.

8) Table X, like all the other tables, demonstrates the virtually loving care and attention lavished on small national minorities—like 56,000 Tatars in the Kirghiz Republic, or 27,000 Ukrainians in the Tadjik Republic, or 26,000 Kurds in Armenia, or 98,000 Lezghians in Azerbaijan (all cited from Table X), all receiving an education in their own languages. By the same token, there are thousands of Jews in Kishinev, capital of Moldavia (Table IX), who are still the proud carriers of Jewish learning and lore, but who are forbidden to transmit it to their children.

Why should the ancient People of the Book be deprived of books in the USSR, be doomed to forcible assimilation, cultural disappearance, spiritual extinction?

No Place to Turn...

(From the testimony to the Ad Hoc Commission on the Rights of Soviet Jews)

VIRTUALLY ALL JEWS WITH WHOM I SPOKE IN THE Soviet Union expressed unmistakably some degree of anxiety arising from their condition *as Jews.* This anxiety varied from, at the least, a definite sense of uneasiness and of considerable uncertainty as to their future in the Soviet Union, to a state of mind which can only be described, even in the most conservative idiom, as terror. My contacts were largely with people ranging in age from early middle age to advanced age, and my general impression that very young people showed somewhat lesser degrees of anxiety might therefore be statistically incorrect. On the whole, the overwhelming majority of the people with whom I spoke were *very much* afraid of their immediate future, and I can only describe the feeling communicated to me by *groups* of Jews as, for example, those I met in synagogues, as representing a state of *palpable, strong fear.* It was very clear that these fears arose from two sources: For one, all Jews with whom I spoke in the Soviet Union are painfully aware of the excesses of anti-Semitism which occurred toward the end of the Stalin period and continued into the earlier years of the Khrushchev regime. In addition, the more recent experiences of the economic trials, of the vicious attacks on Jews and on Judaism which have appeared in many articles in the press and in books, and of the increasing disabilities to which Jews are subjected in terms of religious or cultural expression, loom large in the minds of Jews in the Soviet Union. I had the very strong impression that Jews in the Soviet Union consider themselves as being caught in a vice. On the one hand, the government directs unremitting pressure against all forms of cultural and religious expression by Jews; i.e., toward forced assimilation. But on the other hand, Jews are frequently attacked vituperatively as Jews *ethnically and racially,* making assimilation impossible, and depriving them of *any* area of retreat or comfort: Jews cannot seek refuge or solace in their Jewishness, because almost every means of expressing this Jewishness is stringently forbidden. At the same time, they are not accepted into general society, even if they are prepared to give up entirely the ties which bind them to their traditions, both secular and religious. The Jews in the Soviet Union are very painfully conscious of the fact that at this point they have nowhere to go and no place to turn.

David W. Weiss

TABLE I

Languages of Instruction: Primary, Seven-Year and Secondary Schools, School Year 1955-56
(Total population, USSR, based on 1959 official census figures: 208,827,000)

Republic	*Number of Schools*	*Number with Instruction in Russian*	*Number with Instruction in Non-Russian Native Languages*	*Percentage of Schools with Instruction in Non-Russian Native Languages*	*Percentage of Pupils Taught in Russian-Language Schools*	*Percentage of Pupils Taught in Non-Russian Native Language Schools*	*Number of Languages Used in Teaching*
USSR	193,963	114,908	79,055	41	65	35	59
RSFSR	113,109	101,315	11,794	10	94	6	45
Ukraine	29,361	4,008	25,353	86	26	74	5
Bielorussia	11,346	592	10,754	95	22	78	2
Uzbekistan	5,396	298	5,098	94	20	80	7
Kazakhstan	8,728	3,758	4,970	57	66	34	6
Georgia	4,156	279	3,877	93	20	80	6
Azerbaijan	3,567	170	3,397	95	23	77	4
Lithuania	3,765	131	3,634	97	11	89	3
Moldavia	1,809	487	1,322	73	33	67	3
Latvia	1,498	319	1,179	79	33	67	2
Kirgkhizia	1,700	324	1,376	81	49	51	5
Tadjikistan	2,542	43	2,499	98	16	84	6
Armenia	1,160	53	1,107	95	9	91	4
Turkmenia	1,128	81	1,047	93	21	79	4
Estonia	1,103	69	1,034	94	22	78	2

SOURCE: *Cultural Progress in the USSR*, pp. 192-3, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1958.

TABLE II

Language of Instruction in The Union Republics:
RSFSR—1956-57
(Total population: 117,534,000)

Language	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Russian	97,845,000	83.2
Tatar	4,077,000	3.5
Chuvash	1,436,000	1.2
Mordvinian	1,211,000	1.0
Bashkir	948,000	0.8
Udmurt	613,000	0.5
Mari	498,000	0.4
Komi and Komi-Permiak	426,000	0.36
Avar	268,000	0.2
Buryat	252,000	0.2
Ossetian	248,000	0.2
Yakut	235,000	0.2
Lezghian	223,000	0.2
Kabardin	204,000	0.17
Darghian	158,000	0.1
Kumyk	135,000	0.1
Adyghey	79,000	0 07
Azerbaijanian	71,000	0.06
Lak	64,000	0.05
Khakass	56,000	0.05
Altai	45,000	0.04
Cherkess	30,000	0.025
Nenets	25,000	0.02
Evenk	24,000	0.02
Khant	19,000	0.01
Chukchi	12,000	0.01
Koryak	6,300	0.005

SOURCE: *Kulturnoe Stroitelstvo RSFSR*, Central Statistical Board of RSFSR, Moscow, 1958, pp. 206-209.

TABLE III

Language of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Uzbek SSR—1958-59
(Total population: 8,106,000)

Language	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Uzbek	5,026,000	62.0
Russian	1,101,000	13.6
Kazakh	335,000	4.1
Tadjik	312,000	3.8
Karakalpak	168,000	2.1
Kirghiz	92,000	1.1
Turkmen	57,000	0.7

SOURCE: *Pedagogicheskii Slovar*, Publishing House of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow, 1960, Vol. II, p. 506.

TABLE IV

Language of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Ukraine SSR—1958-59
(Total population: 41,869,000)

Language	*Number of Schools*	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Ukrainian	25,366	31,852,000	76.1
Russian	4,049	7,400,000	17.7
Moldavian	157	239,000	0.6
Hungarian	99	149,000	0.4
Polish	3	363,000	0.9

SOURCE: *Pedagogicheskii Slovar*, Publishing House of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow, 1960, Vol. II, p. 509. Also: Article by Doctor of History V. Malanchuk, Secretary of the Lvov Regional Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, *Pravda*, Moscow, December 16, 1965. Dr. Malanchuk states that in the city of Lvov there are fifty-six Ukrainian-language schools, twenty-nine Russian-language schools and two schools in which Polish is the language of instruction.

TABLE V

Languages of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Kazakh (Year not given, but presumably 1958-59)
(Total population: 9,310,000)

Language	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Russian	4,014,000	43.1
Kazakh	2,755,000	29.6
Uzbek	137,000	1.5
Uigur	60,000	0.6
Dungan	10,000	0.1
Tadjik	(No figures in 1959 census)	

SOURCE: *Pedagogicheskii Slovar*, Publishing House of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow, 1960, Vol. I, p. 490.

TABLE VI
Languages of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Georgian SSR—1962-63
(Total population: 4,044,000)

Language	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Georgian	2,558,000	63.3
Armenian	443,000	11.0
Russian	438,000	10.8
Azerbaijanian	157,000	3.9
Ossetian	141,000	3.5
Abkhaz	71,000	1.8

SOURCE: *Pedagogicheskaya Entsiklopedia,* Publishing House "Sovietskaya Entsiklopedia" (four volumes, of which only two published so far), Moscow, 1964. Vol. I, Column 627.

TABLE VII
Languages of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Turkmen SSR—1956-57
(Total population: 1,516,000)

Language	*Number of Pupils*	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*
Turkmen	154,837	924,000
Russian	47,756	263,000
Uzbek	10,501	125,000
Kazakh	4,176	70,000

SOURCE: *Narodnoe Obrazovanie Turkmenskoi SSR za 40 Let,* Ministry of Education of the Turkmen SSR, Ashkhabad, 1957, p. 21.

TABLE VIII
Languages of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Lithuanian SSR—1964-65
(Total population: 2,711,000)

Language	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*	*Proportion in Total Population*
Lithuanian	2,151,000	79.3
Russian	231,000	8.5
Polish	230,000	8.5

SOURCE: *Pedagogicheskaya Entsiklopedia,* Publishing House "Sovietskaya Entsiklopedia, Moscow, 1964, Vol. II, Column 655. Also: Article by Antanas Snieckus, First Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, *Sovietskaya Litva,* Vilnius, July 23, 1965. According to Mr. Snieckus, there is a total of 227 schools in the Lithuanian Republic where the language of instruction is Polish. Furthermore, there are Polish courses in 83 Lithuanian and Russian schools. In Vilnius, the capital, there is a Polish pedagogical school, and a special section for Polish language and literature at the main Lithuanian Pedagogical

TABLE IX
Languages of Instruction in the Union Republics:
Moldavian SSR—1958-59
(Total population: 2,885,000)
There are in Moldavia 95,000 Jews, according to the 1959 Census, representing 3.3% of the population.

Language of Instruction	*Number of Schools*	*Number of Pupils of Given Nationality*	*Number of that Nationality in Republic*
Moldavian	1,086	266,900	1,887,000
Russian	463	139,700	293,000
Moldavian and Russian	159	——	——
Ukrainian	37	5,300	421,000
Russian and Ukrainian	3	——	——
Moldavian and Ukrainian	1	——	——
Russian and Gagauzi	26	2,000*	96,000*
Moldavian and Gagauzi	1	——	——

*Gagauzi.

SOURCE: *Narodnaya Khozaistvo Moldavia SSR,* Kishinev, 1959.

TABLE X
Language of Instruction in the Union Republics:
School Year—1955-56

Republic	*Language*	*Number of that Nationality*
Kirghiz SSR	Kirghiz	837,000
(Total population:	Russian	624,000
2,066,000)	Uzbek	219,000
	Ukrainian	137,000
	Tatar	56,000
Tadjik SSR	Tadjik	1,051,000
(Total population:	Uzbek	454,000
1,980,000)	Russian	263,000
	Tatar	57,000
	Ukrainian	27,000
	Kirghiz	26,000
Armenian SSR	Armenian	1,552,000
(Total population:	Azerbaijanian	108,000
1,763,000)	Russian	56,000
	Kurdish	26,000
Azerbaijan SSR	Azerbaijanian	2,151,000
(Total population:	Russian	515,000
3,698,000)	Armenian	442,000
	Lezghian	98,000
Bielorussian SSR	Bielorussian	6,444,000
(Total population:	Russian	729,000
8,055,000)		
Latvian SSR	Latvian	1,298,000
(Total population:	Russian	556,000
2,093,000)		
Estonian SSR	Estonian	873,000
(Total population:	Russian	260,000
1,197,000)		

SOURCE: *Cultural Progress in the USSR,* Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1958. For Central Statistical Board of USSR, p. 193.

NOTE: The source does not cite the specific languages of instruction in the given Union Republics. It merely indicates *the number of those languages,* which, however, can be presumed to be the languages of the most populous nationalities of the Republic. This table is constructed on that premise.

Cultural Facilities for Minorities

THE STATISTICAL TABLES THAT FOLLOW CAST A tragically ironic light on the encouragement given the cultures of other small nationalities and on the repression of Jewish culture.

The six other nationalities were chosen at random among the many small, backward ethnic groups with a short history and an impoverished culture—illuminating even more sharply the contrast between the cultural facilities made available to them, and to the Jews, with their ancient tradition of learning and high level of culture and literacy.

All the nationalities chosen have a smaller population than the Jews. The number in each nationality speaking their mother tongue is approximately the same as the corresponding number among the Jews, even though the respective percentages are quite different. In all cases, the bulk of their populations live within the confines of the RSFSR. Though large numbers of Jews also live in the Ukraine and Bielorussia, their largest single concentration is also in the RSFSR. Indeed, there are, in some cases, twice as many Jews in the RSFSR than of others. This fact only heightens the tragic irony—for if the RSFSR, the largest and most powerful and most advanced of the Soviet republics, is capable of providing such a plethora of cultural institutions for the others, it can surely do so for the Jews—who are, moreover, highly urbanized and thus more readily accessible to cultural communications.

The population figures for these seven nationalities in the RSFSR (based on the 1959 census) are as follows: Jews—875,000; Udmurts—613,000; Maris —498,000; Komis—426,000; Chechens—418,756; Yakuts—235,00; Bashkirs—948,000.

Some additional facts about several other ethnic minorities shed further light on the cultural discrimination practiced against Soviet Jews:

The Gypsies—all 132,000 of them throughout the USSR—are blessed with a professional, State-supported repertory theatre, the Moscow Gypsy Theatre. The company has seventy professional members and fourteen full-time students at its own training school. Its productions run to 300-400 performances and sometimes even a thousand. The company has its own theatre in Moscow, seating 400, and nearly every performance is sold out well in advance.

Whereas the Jews, who once had several such great theatres (the most significant one being the Yiddish State Theatre in Moscow, headed by "Soviet People's Artist" Shlomo Mikhoels, who was murdered by the secret police in 1948), saw them all shut down in 1948-49, and their leading lights imprisoned and shot, or done to death in the camps. Today, they must rest content with wandering troupes of amateurs, and a few aging, tired professionals, who perform one and two-night stands all over the country—albeit to hundreds of thousands of enthusiastic customers.

The Buriats—population, 252,959. In 1965, the Literary Union of the Aginsk-Buriat National Region celebrated its 18th anniversary. The Union gives constant aid to organized Buriat literary circles, of which there are nine in the Region, and it supports and encourages many Buriat writers, poets and literary critics.

The Kabardins (population—203,620) and Balkars (population—42,408). Resident in the Kabardino-Balkarsk Autonomous Republic, their alphabets were first created for them after the Bolshevik Revolution. In Nalchik, the capital, there is a State University and other institutions of learning. There are three large daily newspapers, an intellectual magazine and an almanac in the native languages. There is also a Kabardinian theatre and a Balkarian theatre.

The Kurds—population, 58,799—resident in Armenia. There is a monthly literary journal, *Sovietaken Grakanutian*. In general, the Kurds have their own written language, their own newspapers and books. There is a Kurdish Writers' Section attached to the Armenian Writers' Union. A Kurdish Studies Group has been attached to the Sector of Oriental Studies of the Armenian Academy of Science. It does advanced research in the history of the Kurdish people, its language, literature, folklore and ethnography. There is also a Kurdish Radio Committee associated with the general Armenian radio network. There are Kurdish schools and Kurdish teachers, in their native language.

The Tatars—population, 4,967,701. In the Tatar Autonomous Republic, whose people until recently were almost totally illiterate, there are twelve institutions of higher learning with 54,000 students, 18,000 of which are Tatars. In 1,435 of the 3,389 schools instruction is in Tatar. More than 5,000,000 copies of Tatar books are published yearly. Half of the Republic's 25 newspapers and eight periodicals are in the Tatar language.

From 1948 to 1961, no living Soviet Jewish writer was able to publish any of his work in his own country in the language in which he wrote, Yiddish. (Hebrew, of course, was strictly forbidden long before 1948.) It was only toward the end of 1961, with the establishment of the bi-monthly *Sovietish Heimland*, that Soviet Jewish writers found a forum—chiefly for their shorter works. Again, not one Yiddish volume by a living Jewish writer appeared from 1948 until 1964.

A lone Jewish periodical and barely more than

half a dozen living Jewish books—as over against the rich and vast cultural paraphernalia for all these other nationalities.

* * *

A note on the tables: Table I is based on the official Soviet publication, *Itogi Vsesoyuznoi Perepisi Naseleniya 1959 goda,* the 1959 Census Results, published in Moscow in 1962.

Tables II, III, V and VI are based on *Pechat v SSR v 1964 goda,* Moscow, 1964.

The tables cite only the Yiddish language as the official language of the Jewish nationality—for Hebrew has for decades been considered either an "unlanguage" or, at the very least, a reactionary, clerical language unfit for use in a Socialist society.

TABLE I
Eight Nationalities, 1959 Census

Nationality	*Total Population*	*Number Citing National Language as Mother Tongue*
Jews	2,267,814	487,786
Udmurts	624,794	556,741
Maris	504,205	479,587
Komis and Komi-Permiaks	430,928	382,370
Chechens	418,756	413,924
Yakuts	236,655	230,762
Bashkirs	989,040	612,169

SOURCE: *Itogi Vsesoyuznoi Perepisi Naseleniya 1959 goda* (1959 Census Results), published Moscow, 1962, page 184, Table 53.

TABLE II
Books Published in 1964

Language	*In National Language*		*Translated Into National Language*	
	No. of Books	*No. of Copies*	*No. of Books*	*No. of Copies*
Yiddish	2	18,000	No data supplied (actually—none)	
Udmurt	33	109,000	15	62,000
Mari	56	180,000	22	45,000
Komi and Komi-Permiak	46	149,000	10	48,000
Chechen	28	99,000	8	12,000
Yakut	68	298,000	52	269,000
Bashkir	94	463,000	44	275,000

TABLE III
Belle-Lettres Publication

Language	*1918-1964*		*In 1964*	
	No. of Books	*No. of Copies*	*No. of Books*	*No. of Copies*
Yiddish	No data supplied		No data supplied	
Udmurt	320	1,735,000	24	297,000
Mari	559	2,781,000	37	434,000
Komi	322	1,665,000	21	295,000
Chechen-Ingush	261	817000	33	166,000
Yakut	574	4,280,000	32	163,000
Bashkir	1,149	8,866,000	62	798,000

TABLE IV
Yiddish Book Publication, 1917-1966

1917—150	1931—496	1945— 14
1918—237	1932—668	1946— 19
1919—274	1933—391	1947— 52
1920—106	1934—348	1948— 60
1921— 85	1935—437	
1922— 68	1936—431	1949 to 1958—none
1923— 40	1937—356	1959— 3
1924— 76	1938—348	1960—none
1925—168	1939—339	1961— 2
1926—164	1940—359	1962—none
1927—217	1941— 22	1963—none
1928—238	1942— 2	1964— 2
1929—319	1943— 24	1965— 3
1930—531	1944— 18	1966— 1

NOTE: The extraordinary drop from 359 Yiddish books in 1940 to 22 in 1941 and only 2 in 1942 was the result of the chaos and confusion attendant upon the evacuation of virtually all Yiddish writers from Moscow (either to the interior or as front-line volunteers) in the first two years of the Nazi onslaught on the Soviet Union. Most of the writers volunteered for service in the Red Army; the remainder followed the government.

In 1943, a Yiddish publishing house, "Der Emes" (The Truth), was organized in Moscow and publication of Yiddish books was resumed gradually and painfully. By 1947 and 1948, as the country was beginning to reconstruct, Yiddish book publication again began to achieve a respectable level, and far more ambitious plans were announced, late in 1948, for 1949 and subsequent years.

At the end of 1948, however, along with the obliteration of all Jewish cultural institutions and activities, "Der Emes" was shut down; the Yiddish typeface in its possession was confiscated and melted down, and its doors were padlocked. More than a decade of silence ensued.

TABLE V
Periodicals Published in National Language, 1964

Language	*Number of Periodicals*	*Number of Issues in 1964*	*Circulation Per Issue*
Yiddish*	1	6	25,000
Udmurt	3	38	8,000
Mari	5	44	26,000
Komi	3	25	7,000
Chechen	4	19	4,000
Yakut	4	36	19,000
Bashkir	7	87	63,000

**Sovietish Heimland,* a literary bimonthly that made its appearance in August-September 1961. Since January 1965 it is a monthly.

TABLE VI
Newspapers Published in National Language, 1964

Language	*Number of Newspapers*	*Number of Issues in 1964*	*Circulation Per Issue*
Yiddish*	No data supplied	——	No data supplied
Udmurt	13	2,330	67,000
Mari	10	1,757	30,000
Komi	2	308	17,000
Chechen	4	467	28,000
Yakut	14	2,188	85,000
Bashkir	13	2,203	140,000

*A footnote indicates that, in addition to those figuring in the table, newspapers in other languages, "such as Yiddish, Ossetian and others," also appeared. The only Soviet Jewish newspaper is the *Birobidjaner Shtern,* which appears in Yiddish three times a week with a circulation of 1,000. It is published in the Soviet Far East and contains nothing of interest to the vast bulk of Soviet Jewry thousands of miles

The Germans and the Jews: A Study in Contrast

A STUDY OF THE SITUATION OF THE GERMAN MINORITY in the Soviet Union sheds much light on the situation of the Jewish minority in that country. At first glance, they appear to have some important characteristics in common. In size of population, the Jews are the eleventh most populous Soviet nationality and the Germans are thirteenth. They are both widely dispersed throughout the USSR, though their main concentrations are in different sectors of the country. Both came to Russia from the West; both came centuries ago; and both have lived there continuously since then. Both groups, for much of their existence on Russian soil, were characterized by a profound religious motif in their group life. Both lived hard-working, inward lives, rather separated from other national and religious groups, but without a record of hostility or violence toward them. Both the Germans and the Jews were among those small Soviet nationalities that suffered most from Stalin's terror.

The historical and contemporary similarities have their surface appeal. But it is the profound contrast in their fate today that is most astonishing and illuminating. That the Germans are regaining, however gradually and incompletely, the prerogatives and facilities through which to secure their future as a national entity is certainly not astonishing, for that is the direction in which Soviet policy is generally moving with regard to the nationalities. What is illuminating is the contrast between the officially encouraged enlargement of possibilities for the Germans—and the utter elimination of options for the Jews.

Early German Settlement

German settlement in Russia came in two great waves. The first, from 1550 to 1750, consisted mainly of urban dwellers. The second, from 1763 to 1824, was identified with the systematic Tsarist policy of land colonization and consisted primarily of peasants.

The Germans first appeared in important numbers as early as the middle of the 16th century, when Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584) invited German officers, technical workers, craftsmen, merchants, teachers to come to Russia and help build its cities. Most of them retained their German citizenship and often considered themselves merely temporary residents of Russia. Others, chiefly among the higher officials, became identified with the Russian ruling class and quickly gave up their German tongue and culture.

The second wave of German immigration to Russia was initiated by Catherine the Great (1762-1796) and was continued by Alexander I (1801-1825). Catherine vigorously pursued the Europeanization begun by Peter the Great, and she systematically sought Western scientists and scholars. But the policy that brought some 32,000 Germans to Russia in her reign and about 50,000 in that of Alexander I was designed to colonize rich but unpopulated areas of the Empire.

The inception of the policy is to be found in Catherine's Edict of July 22, 1763, which set forth the basic rights and privileges to be accorded to all new colonizing settlers: freedom of religion; freedom from taxation for from ten to thirty years on the land, and for ten years in the cities; interest-free loans for all new constructive economic enterprises; "eternal" exemption from military service; autonomous self-rule in communal and educational establishments; an unalienable gift from the Crown to each family—land ranging from 79 acres to 215 acres.

On February 20, 1804, Alexander issued a similar Edict. He even sent agents to Germany to recruit peasants and craftsmen. So began the second great wave of German immigration to Russia, from 1763 to 1824.

In general, the German immigrants who came directly from their old peasant villages and from all over Germany left their homes for a variety of reasons. Many chafed under foreign political domination of their territory; others resented the political tyranny of their own rulers. Many, chiefly the Mennonites—who are conscientious objectors to war—left to avoid forced military service. Then there were the other factors which commonly impelled people to seek new lives: religious oppression, hunger, poverty, landlessness, heavy taxation.

Religious faith was clearly a far more decisive factor in determining the composition of a new settlement than was the new settlers' place of origin in Germany. Nowhere in Russia, for a long time, were there religiously mixed German colonies. On the other hand, each colony had people from many different places in Germany. Each settlement was exclusively Evangelical or Catholic or Mennonite. Only where religious affiliation and place of origin were coextensive was the settlement composed of people who came from the same area in Germany.

The closed community, the church and the school *(Volkstum, Kirche, Schule)* were intimately bound together in the life of the Germans in Russia, enabling them to maintain their cohesion for the last two centuries despite the calamities of dispossession, deportation, forced labor, dispersion and humiliation.

To this day, their consciousness as Germans remains alive, and indeed has begun to quicken.

Resistance to Pressure

The Germans' first major hardships began under Tsar Alexander II (1855-1881), when efforts were made to Russify them and their institutions. (In this, of course, they were not alone; virtually all non-Russian groups bore the brunt of this policy.) After 1871, Pan-Slavist, chauvinist elements gained the upper hand in the ruling circle around the Tsar. This resulted in a strongly anti-German foreign policy and distrust of the Germans at home.

One after another, many of the German privileges began to shrink. The autonomy granted the Volga and Black Sea Germans was withdrawn; henceforth they were under the Ministry of Interior—in effect, wards of the police. After 1880, Russification began in earnest. The Germans had created more than three thousand schools. Thenceforth, the curricula for all were set in Moscow, and Russian replaced German as the language of instruction, except in the teaching of the German language itself. (However, German remained the spoken tongue in all other key areas of life.)

The Germans resisted in various ways, but *internal spiritual resistance* was strongest of all. Aided by the fact that their colonies were closed settlements, by their determination to use their language at all times and their insistence on marriage strictly within the fold—most of their rights and institutions remained more or less intact until 1914.

World War I brought with it anti-German hysteria and excesses. A law was enacted calling for the confiscation of all German-owned land. German newspapers wer shut down. The use of the German language in public was banned. The German schools were transformed into Russian schools. Gatherings of two or more Germans in public were punishable by law. The entire Volhynian German population, numbering around 200,000, was deported to Siberia. Only the democratic revolution of February 1917 prevented the deportation of the Volga and Black Sea Germans. (How similar to Stalin's later policy was the Tsar's!)

The democratic provisional governments that ruled Russia for the next eight months adopted a policy of expanding toleration not only of political parties but of the minority nationalities. In April 1917, for the first time in Russian history, a Congress of Germans gathered in Moscow, speaking in the name of two million Germans. It demanded the restoration of all German rights, and established an Association of Russian Germans. The German schools were reopened, and German was reinstated as an official language in heavily populated German areas. Communal and cultural organizations flowered.

The Bolshevik Revolution brought all this to a close. Civil War and Communism wreaked havoc with them as with so much of the population of that troubled land. The Germans, as independent farmers, had been very loyal to the old regime and had had few or no connections with revolutionary circles. Inevitably, they were under suspicion as *kulaks* and were subjected to assault by the new revolutionary regime.

With the inception of the New Economic Policy after 1921, aimed at encouraging private enterprise to rebuild Russia, the Germans began to come to themselves. Small farmers found they could survive well. Commerce was encouraged. The churches began to rebuild. In 1924, the Volga German ASSR (Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic)—a constituent part of the Russian Republic—was created. The Black Sea Germans also received their rights back. But all nationwide German organizations were banned.

Periods of Hardship

Two periods of extreme rigor followed for the Germans, as for the rest of the population: 1928-32, the period of forced agricultural collectivization; and 1936-39, the period of the Great Purge. As independent farmers, they were dispossessed and the large numbers who resisted collectivization were deported to Northern Russia and Siberia.

The Great Purge affected the Germans pretty much as it did most others—the loss of their national intelligentsia through deportation and execution, shutdown of churches, a ban in 1937 on the use of German as a language of instruction in all schools of the German communities *except* for those in the Volga German ASSR.

In fact, the existence of this autonomous republic, and the early decision of its inhabitants to come to terms with collectivization, obviated for the Volga Germans the worst features of the terror inflicted by Stalin on the population during the decade following 1928. Indeed, their *kolkhozes* were nationally viewed as models and they themselves were praised for their loyalty to the State and Communism.

The Nazi onslaught on the Soviet Union in June 1941 marked a turning-point in the history of the Russian Germans. It brought to an end German settlement in areas they had inhabited for a century and a half. Stalin deported whole nationalities in the most cruel manner. The only Soviet Germans not deported were those of Volhynia and Transniestria. They were spared simply because their land was overrun by Nazis and they became part of the front. As the Nazis retreated from Russia in 1943-44, they brought some 350,000 of these Germans with them to Germany. At war's end, Soviet forces found about 200-250,000 of them there, and sent them back to

forced labor in the Komi ASSR and Central Asia.

Rehabilitating Soviet Germans

For nearly 15 years, virtually nothing was heard from or about the Soviet Germans in exile and forced labor. In September 1955, however, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer arrived in Moscow to negotiate the establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Bonn. As a humanitarian matter, he asked for the repatriation of German prisoners of war and other German citizens still held by the Soviets. The Soviet desire to please him played a role in the amnesty which Moscow issued at the end of the year.

This was an Edict of the Supreme Soviet, dated December 13, 1955. It released the Soviet Germans and their families from "special settlements"—forced labor camps and other restricted areas of residence and punishment. It also removed them from the control of the secret police.

Nine years later, in a decree dated August 29, 1964, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR fully rehabilitated the Soviet Germans.* It declared bluntly that the accusations made against them by Stalin were unfounded. Moreover, it spoke of the patriotic sacrifices of Soviet Germans during the war, and of their prominent role in the building of Communism. Above all, it looked to the future and instructed the governments of the various Union Republics where Germans live to aid the economic and cultural reconstruction of their lives.

Gradually, the Germans began moving into the cities and towns where they could find employment and other Germans. Very gradually—but at an accelerating tempo—they began to create new communal, cultural and educational institutions. Though they no longer had a territory of their own, nor very many churches, their sense of *volkstum* remained potent, and the reconstruction of the *schule* and of other cultural forms developed apace.

We single out for discussion one area of substantial German settlement in European Russia because a description of life there will lead directly into the broader discussion of German cultural and educational life in the USSR in general. The area is the Komi ASSR, one thousand kilometers northeast of Moscow. The people there engage mainly in forestry and coal mining.

These people live in small towns and also in cities like Vorkuta and Syktyvkar, the capital. In the latter, where most of the Germans can be found, there are three basic characteristics of contemporary Soviet German cultural life: books, cultural activities, German-language instruction in the schools.

The magnificent public library has some 2,500 German titles, mostly the classics. Every club and school has its own lending library. There are also two large bookstores and several bookstalls. The most popular modern literature of 20th-century Germany can be found there—Thomas and Heinrich Mann, Arnold Zweig, Franz Werfel, Leon Feuchtwanger. They also possess all the books published in the German Democratic Republic, as well as the works of "Group 47," an avant-garde, West Germany literary group whose leading light is Heinrich Boll.

All this is encouraged by the German teachers who seek to promote an interest in modern German literature. There are German clubs at the schools and a German club for adults that present cultural "soirees." One evening might be a Goethe-Beethoven soiree at which school children recite German poetry, a Soviet German writer gives a talk on the two cultural heroes being commemorated, and a local music ensemble performs. Such events are wildly cheered.

Widespread Cultural Activities

This description of an actual German evening in Syktyvkar could serve as a model of the kind of cultural activities that go on far and wide among the Soviet Germans. *Neues Leben* is chockful of regular reports of such events. Here are some within the past year: a German cultural evening for the German population in the auditorium of the Yefremov factory in Novosibirsk . . . a German Circle for students in Nebit-Dag, Turkmenia . . . a series of cultural and musical evenings for the German villages in the Bashkir ASSR . . . in Sokolniki, Tula Region, a Schubert Evening . . . a German-language film produced at the request of the German teachers in School Number 86 in Ufa . . . cultural activities in the Leninpol area . . . a performance by the students of the Middle School Number 6 in Tomsk of Brecht's "Caucasian Chalk Circle" . . . a German amateur chorus performs all over the villages of East Kazakhstan . . . a series of German lectures in Ossokarovka, Karaganda Territory, on the history of German culture, followed by German songs and dances . . . German evenings, a tradition in Pavlodar, Kazakhstan . . . a German concert by the Concert Group of the Sovkhoz "Urumkaiski," Kokchetav Territory . . . a German concert in the city of Kansk, Krasnoyarsk area . . . a German Evening at Novokuznetsk, Altai . . . a popular concert by the Alma Ata German Amateur Circle . . . the 140th anniversary of Johann Strauss celebrated in Dzhambul . . . the Orenburg People's Chorus visits various *kolkhozes* every summer . . . an amateur orchestra in Kokchetav plays German classisal music and folk songs and tours villages and settlements where Germans live . . . the German amateur theatre of the Issyk School presents a variety program in the Alma Ata district . . . in Saran, Kazakhstan, the German teacher of the Saran Voca-

*According to the 1959 Soviet Census, there are 1,619,000 Soviet Germans, the 13th most populous nationality.

tional School gave a lecture, followed by a concert given by the students of the German Department of the school . . . the "Club of the Friends of the German Language" meets monthly in Kharkov.

These reports, taken at random from *Neues Leben*, illustrate the scope of German cultural activities all over the country. More and more these are meeting with encouragement of the authorities and the enthusiasm of the audiences.

Radio and TV

German-language broadcasting has been expanding in scope since its inception in 1957. It has come to include not merely news and Communist Party political propaganda, but material of genuine cultural value for the Germans.

Radio Moscow has two daily broadcasts in German. In the mornings, the broadcast is on both medium wave and short wave; in the afternoons it is broadcast on both long wave and short wave.

The most active German broadcasting is done in the Kazakh SSR, which has at least four stations that originate German-language shows. The most important is the radio station in Alma Ata, capital of the republic, which reaches the bulk of the large German population there. Radio Kazakhstan, as it is called, began German broadcasting in 1957. (It also broadcasts in Uigur, Uzbek, Korean, as well as, of course, Kazakh and Russian.) On September 9, 1964, the Central Radio Council of Kazakhstan ruled that all centrally produced German broadcasts should be repeated by all local stations in the republic. Should the time interfere with other local broadcasts, the Council declared, the broadcasts from the central Alma Ata station are to be recorded and put on the air later or on the following day.

There are two other, recent additions to the list of Kazakhstan radio stations broadcasting in German. In December 1965, regular German broadcasting was initiated in the Shemonaicha Region of East Kazakhstan. The programs concentrate on politics, German-language instruction, and German music performed by German ensembles. And in January 1966, Radio Saran began a systematic program of political and cultural broadcasts in German. The radio station in Tselinograd has been airing German shows regularly for some time. All this is, of course, in addition to the systematic repetition of Radio Kazakhstan shows on all local stations.

In Omsk, Siberia, just across the northern border of Kazakhstan, there is a major old German center of population. Radio Omsk broadcasts in German to them twice weekly, on Tuesday and Sunday evenings. And there are also regular German broadcasts over Radio Frunze, in the capital of the Kirghiz SSR.

As for television, there are three stations broadcasting regularly in German: one is the Omsk TV station; the other two are in Kazakhstan—one in Alma Ata, and the other in Karaganda, which last October started a weekly program called, with symbolic appropriateness, "The Voice of the Mother Tongue."

The first broadcast on this TV station holds significance. The director of the station commented that the broadcasts are intended to let the audience see, among other things, "something of the life and achievements of the German Democratic Republic [GDR] and some of the best representatives of German proletarian art. . . . " Moreover, the broadcasts will make use of film strips and television shows produced in East Germany. Then the broadcast proceeded with a review of developments in both East and West Germany, and with a report on *Neues Leben*. The show concluded with a filmed concert in German.

The significance of this announcement is plain: It recognizes the natural interest of Soviet Germans in the life of Germans elsewhere, and it accepts the validity of cultural links between Soviet Germans and Germans outside Soviet borders. The acceptance of such links helps break down both the spiritual isolation and alienation of the Soviet Germans. It makes them feel a part of a historical-social entity known as the Germans, wherever they may live.

Promoting Fraternal Ties

This is by no means the only form of association with Germans outside the USSR. Books form another powerful bond. Bookstores all over the country, for example, sell the popular East German volumes, *Handbook of the GDR* and *GDR—300 Questions and Answers*. The Druzhba Book Store in Moscow, the main outlet for foreign books, handles a huge volume of books published in East Germany, and sells them by mail all over the country. *Neues Leben* publishes notices of books just arrived from Germany.

Moreover, libraries in areas of heavy German population carry both the German classics and new volumes imported from the GDR. One of the main features is a steady supply of children's books. Finally, and in a way most significant—for it gives the clearest stamp of official Soviet approval—Soviet publishing houses produce many German books by writers in both East and West Germany.

Neues Leben also calls attention to even small items of cultural interest relating Soviet Germans to Germany, thus helping to create an intangible but nonetheless real atmosphere of a united community. For example, it will tell of a permanent library in Perm that has "lovely childrens' books" from the GDR, as well as a German traveling library in that area . . . of a talk on the achievements of the GDR at a German soireé in Krasnoyarsk . . . of a German Circle at a school in the Turkmen SSR whose members correspond with other students in the GDR, and of many other such "pen pal" groups. Or, it will publish re-

views of East German books and biographies of East German writers and scholars . . . and a series of articles on the GDR entitled, "Seen, Heard and Experienced in the GDR," and one on West Germany entitled, "Trip Beyond the Elbe."

Libraries and Bookstores

With what are the libraries and bookstores stocked? First, some overall statistics: In 1964—the latest year for which the figures are available—233 books were published in German in the USSR (69 of them belles-lettres), in a total edition of 13,015,000. Of these, 144 books were written in German and included 35 books by East German authors and 14 books by West German authors. 89 volumes were translated into German from other languages.

And all this is entirely apart from the large numbers of books imported directly from both Germanies.

What kinds of German books are available in the USSR? There are books by and about Heine, Schiller, Goethe, Feuerbach, Lessing, Kleist and other German classics—and volumes of German peasant jokes and of German folklore and folk sayings. Other kinds of books—literary, technical, children's and educational—bring those ties of continuity with the German people up to date. For example, among the German books published and imported are Arnold Zweig, Thomas Mann, Heinrich Mann, Anna Seghers, Johannes Becher, Berthold Brecht. A great number of textbooks also appear, for the various school grades; and scores of children's books—adventure stories, romances, biography, verse.

A different but vital kind of German contemporaneity is reflected in the varied technical books available. All this testifies to the fact that German is—and is encouraged to be—a living language of growing value and use to Soviet Germans.

As for the future, an indication is given in a statement issued by the Progress Publishing House in Moscow, which is mainly responsible for foreign-language-book publication in the USSR. Among the items listed for appearance in 1966 are translations into German of the works of well known Soviet novelists, children's books, numerous art books and photo albums, works of Soviet German writers, volumes of materials for amateur art, for various kinds of extra-curricular activities for students and home-reading materials for school children. The theme, as the publishing director put it, is "Every Second Day—A New Book."

The future reveals itself in other ways. In 1960, a collection of Soviet German literature entitled *Hand in Hand* was published in Moscow and contained the work of 29 poets. An entirely new collection published last May, entitled *Hand in Hand II,* has the work of 60 poets. In other words, the number of Soviet poets are doubled since 1960.

The literary life of Soviet Germans is recognized and honored also in institutional forms, which in the long run are the most important. For example, in Krasnoyarsk there is a German Section of the Krasnoyarsk branch of the Soviet Writers' Union. And, far more important, a little over a year ago seven of the most distinguished Soviet German writers—Friedrich Bolger, Victor Klein, Herbert Henke, Sepp Osterreicher, Dominik Hollman, Rudolf Jacquemien, Edmund Gunther—were delegates to the Writers Congress of the RSFSR in Moscow. After discussions with the leaders there, they came away with four promises which they triumphantly announced in the pages of *Neues Leben:* the formation of a German Section of the RSRFSR Writers' Union; the convocation of a conference of German writers on a nationwide Soviet basis; the establishment of a literary magazine; the production of more textbooks and more books on pedagogical methods for German teachers.

Although only the last of the four promises has thus far been fulfilled, the German writers and *NL* keep on pressing for the others, and for additional forms of German cultural and literary life. There seems no reason to think they will not get them.

The New German Image

Both *NL* and the general Soviet press have been doing a systematic and effective job of rebuilding Soviet German morale and of projecting a new image—that of the "good"' German. Week in, week out, *NL* features news items and pictorial spreads about Soviet Germans who excel in, or who have been honored for, major contributions to the industrial or agricultural construction of the country.

Another form which this takes is the many articles which *NL* publishes about the heroism of Soviet Germans during World War II. Indeed, *NL* regularly reports on meetings of German Circles or German soireés during which the heroic role of the Soviet Germans is recounted. But the build-up of Soviet German pride is not restricted to *NL.* Here is a telling excerpt from an article in *Trud,* one of the three most important national Soviet newspapers (January 31, 1965):

> It is known that on the territory of our country there live close to two million citizens of German origin.
>
> Soviet Germans! They include the Hero of the Soviet Union, Robert Klein, who, in the hard years of the war, had commanded a group of scouts in the partisan junction of Kovpak, and Savely Frank, now the Hero of Socialist Labor, the head of the Sovhozny Zheleznodorozhny in the Kustanay Region. They also include the famous throughout Siberia Alexander Bekker, a *kolkhoz* brigadier, who has been elected to the Soviet Parliament, and the writer Dominik Golman who lives in Krasnoyarsk. They include thousands of patriots who had fought for the Soviet Re-

gime at the fronts of the Civil War and who had fought to death against the fascists, and they include the remarkable heroes of labor in our days.

For the Germans, as for the citizens of other nationalities, there have been created in the USSR all the conditions assisting their cultural and political growth. In the five Union Republics, where they live and work, at the wish of the parents, the children of Soviet Germans learn their native language in schools. The central radio of Moscow, the radio of Alma-Ata, Frunze and Tselinograd, constantly conduct special broadcast for them in the German language. Newspapers are also published. With great enthusiasm have the Soviet Germans lately greeted the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR, which refutes the general accusations, permitted in the years of the Stalin personality cult, against large groups of Germans—Soviet citizens—allegedly of assisting and abetting the Fascist invaders.

This eloquent tribute requires no commentary.

Still another facet of the projection of the new image is the attention paid in the general Soviet press to "good" Germans—those who had opposed the Nazis in Germany or who had organized resistance movements there, or who had befriended Soviet citizens imprisoned in Germany. Noteworthy also, in this connection, is the tribute paid by *NL* to a new Soviet hero—Richard Sorge, the German Communist who while serving brilliantly in the German Embassy in Tokyo during the 1930s performed major feats of espionage for Stalin.

The crucial importance of a national press for a national minority in any social setting, and especially in the Soviet context, needs no rehearsing. It serves many vital purposes—cultural, educational, communal—but not least as a booster of national morale.

The Soviet German Press

This is surely true for the Soviet German press. Although only one Soviet German newspaper has emerged in the West, we know of the existence of three more—and it is very likely that even more exist. The most important is, of course, *NL*, published weekly by *Pravda* in Moscow, as the official organ of the "Soviet German population." It is a sixteen-page tabloid with many pictures.

The others of which we know are *Rote Fahne,* which appears twice a week in Slavgorod, the main city on the Kulunda Steppes of southwestern Siberia; *Arbeiter,* published in Barnaul, chief city of the Altai, as the "Deutsche Zeitung des Altaigaues" ("The German Newspaper of the Altai District"); and *Freundschaft,* which appears five days a week, having just been founded in January 1966 in Tselinograd, Kazakhstan.

Neues Leben is not, however, just another newspaper, and it is worthwhile to consider its tremendous significance to the Soviet German.

First, a look at its physical setup. It has a fairly standard set of internal departments. The first couple of pages are devoted to general Soviet and world news and Communist Party commentary. The next couple of pages are given over to descriptions of contributions being made by individual Soviet Germans to the country's economy; there will be pictures, short and long articles on many of these near-heroes of Communist labor. Then there are anywhere from one to three pages devoted to news, articles and discussion on German education. There is a regular children's page, and an occasional woman's or family page. There are also crossword and other puzzles —one of whose main functions is didactic. There is invariably a section on vocabulary and on "German Self-Taught." Finally, there is always a little section of names of people being sought and names and addresses of people seeking them—a quiet form of reunion of dispersed families and friends.

But this physical description far from exhausts the scope of *NL.* As indicated earlier, it calls attention to German books, bookstores and libraries all over the country. It carries on a ceaseless struggle for the expansion and enhancement of every form of German cultural, literary and educational life. It bolsters legitimate pride by publishing material on the German contribution to Soviet construction. It is the central channel of communication among Germans all over the country—a place where they can ask questions, exchange opinions, express criticism and put forward demands. It is, so to speak, the main German cultural bulletin board.

In all these ways, it has become the champion of Soviet German life and culture, and in so being it has been the single most decisive factor in building the dignity, self-respect and self-confidence of the Soviet German community. For, while there is no German community (except in the closed agrarian settlements of the Urals) in the physical sense, *NL* manifestly has created the authentic ambience of community—and it has made itself *the address* of that community.

The Educational Tool

It goes without saying that the single most vital institution for the perpetuation of a group's language and culture is the school. For the Soviet Germans, the first great breakthrough, after a decade and a half of silence on the educational front, came with the April 1957 Decree of the Minister of Education of the RSFSR, J. Afanasenko—"Concerning the Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Children and Adults of German Nationality." (Note the reference to adults, for after so many years of no schooling a generation had grown up without formal knowledge of the language, though they did still use it at home.)

There is no all-Union Ministry of Education, but

the other republics generally look to the RSFSR as a model, so after April 1957 the other republics where Germans live in large numbers gradually adopted similar decrees and regulations. The last to do so was the Uzbek Ministry of Education, in October 1963. It would probably be impossible now to list all the places in each of the republics where German children are receiving a German-language education. Suffice it to say that tens of thousands of them are doing so in hundreds of schools all over the area where German population exists—and the numbers grow from school year to school year. One recent official figure is know: In Kazakhstan during the 1964-65 school year, 33,000 pupils studied German as mother tongue, as contrasted with 16,000 in 1957-58. There are possibly at least as many in the RSFSR.

Theoretically, the German parents have been permitted a choice between two kinds of German education for their children. The first would be an adaptation of "national schools"—the form used in the school where nationalities are a majority on their own territory, and the national language is the language of instruction for all subjects from the first to the 11th grades (the full length of the Soviet school).

The second is what is called "mother-tongue instruction" in the German language. This has meant that Russian is the language of instruction for all subjects beginning in the first grade, and that German becomes the language of instruction beginning only in the second grade and lasting through the eighth grade and is used only for the teaching of the language itself as well as German literature.

In practice, the parents, when they were allowed the carefully circumscribed and controlled choice, picked the second mode over the first. Ostensibly they did so because they recognized that Russian is the great language of advanced education and successful careers in the Soviet Union; in fact, the likelihood is that the parents were too cautious to request more than the minimum which unsympathetic officials on the middle and lower levels were willing to allow them.

In any event, this is the system which has prevailed, although here and there, in certain sections of the RSFSR, Kazakhstan and Kirghizia, cautious steps are being taken to extend the mother-tongue instruction in German into the upper grades (9th—11th) as well.

Demands for the German Language

There are many places where German instruction has not been introduced at all, or only partially and grudgingly. This is the result of either the opposition of local officials or of "assimilationist" parents, or both. In this situation *Neues Leben* has played a crucial role in overcoming the local foot-dragging. First, it publishes frequent bitter complaints from German parents in such localities. If the problem is with assimilationist Germans, the editors take them to task and shame them into changing front. But if, as is mostly the case, local officials are to blame, *NL* takes the complaint directly to higher republican educational authorities—and in innumerable instances, positive results were virtually instantaneous and orders came down overruling the recalcitrant officials.

What is perhaps most important is that, very gradually, *Neues Leben* is beginning to register the demands of teachers, German higher pedagogues and parents, for the expansion of German instruction. Some ask for more hours. Others ask for the introduction of more German literary text. Above all, voices are beginning to be heard demanding that entire new subjects of the curriculum be taught in German, replacing Russian! Thus, just a month ago, on February 9, 1966, *NL* published a letter from several German teachers in Luxemburg, Kirghizia to this effect. They add: "We already have teachers just as capable of teaching geography, physics, literature and other subjects in German as in Russian. Textbooks for some of these subjects are also available. . . ."

It was best and most forcefully expressed by the dean of Soviet German educators, Victor Klein, in an article for *NL* last September 29. As he summed it parents, for the expansion of German instruction. up: "We want to make sure that instruction in our mother tongue should not be treated as a mere appendix, but should be granted its due position in the education of Soviet German children. A mother tongue is and remains a mother tongue. Its position should therefore be in the foreground!"

In 1957 there were literally no textbooks for German instruction. By 1964, a Soviet source was able to report that thirteen texts had been published and republished in as many as 431 editions. In the past two years, many more texts have been written and published, in ever larger editions.

As with textbooks, so with teachers in 1957. There were old former teachers scattered around the country, survivors of the purges and deportations, who had of necessity gone into other fields of work. With the issuance of the official decrees authorizing German instruction and with parents' meetings demanding a supply of teachers, the old-timers were impressed into service, as teachers, as principals and as trainers of a new generation of teachers.

With the aid and encouragement of the authorities, teacher-training institutions were gradually brought into being. Today, nine years after zero, the results are truly impressive.

Teachers for beginners' classes (2nd to 4th grades) are trained at specially created *German Departments of Teachers' Academies* in the following cities: Slavgorod, Orenburg, Issil-Kul (near Omsk), Saran (near Karaganda) and Karaganda. These are three-year courses.

Pedagogic classes have been instituted in the upper

classes of *certain secondary schools* to prepare especially gifted pupils to continue their German studies at teachers' academies. Such classes have been established at Karaganda, Semipalatinsk and Aktyubinsk.

Teachers for the intermediate level (5th to 8th grades) are trained in four-year courses in the *German Departments of Teachers' Colleges* in the following cities: Barnaul, Novosibirsk, Orenburg, Omsk, Kokchetav, Chelyabinsk and Alma Ata (the last three having been created only since 1964).

The Teachers' Colleges at Omsk and Kokchetav also have *extension courses and correspondence courses* for teachers. The extension course at the Alma Ata Teachers' College graduated 450 German teachers between 1958 and 1964.

Advanced teacher training is also obtained at the newly created *German Language Departments* of the *Foreign Languages Institutes* of the *Universities of Alma Ata and Kokchetav* and in the *Evening Division* of the *Kirghizia State University* at Frunze.

On the basis of the steady expansion of every variety and level of German education over the past decade, there can be no doubt that significant new progress—in methods, in texts, in teacher caliber, in scope and depth of pupil education—will be made in the years ahead. The Soviet Germans can at last look ahead, however slow and jagged the course may appear to be, to new generations who know their language and literature and take a natural pride in their cultural heritage.

Striking Differences

The contrast with the Jews is profound and tragic.

The Jewish association with Russia, antedating that of the Germans, was always a vital thing, building layer upon layer of faith, culture, and civilization. For many centuries, the Tsarist Empire, for all that it was wickedly oppressive and viciously anti-Semitic, was the abode of Jewish piety and learning, of thousands of synagogues and *yeshivoth*, of scores of thousands of saints, sages and scholars.

The traditions and institutions of learning, community welfare and social idealism that were the crowning glory of Russian Jewish life, despite all the misery, poverty and persecution imposed by the Tsarist regime, were transmuted into new forms in the confrontation of Judaism and modernity, alongside the still thriving older forms.

The elevation of Yiddish from a jargon into a refined literary language; the evolution of Hebrew from a language of prayer and study into a living modern tongue; the creation of rich literature in both languages; the rise of Zionism as a mass movement and especially of the ideas and forces that gave rise to the characteristic forms of social cooperation in Palestine and Israel; the creation of the idealistic Jewish labor movement with its subsequent impact on the American labor and reform movements; and, not least, the engagement of the restless passions and creative talents, nourished and fortified in the ghetto, of thousands of young Jews newly emancipated from the ghetto and thrust into making revolutions or building new industries or performing music or leading liberal, humane public endeavors—all these are among the proud fruits of Russian Jewry.

Even under the Soviet regime, much remained alive. Yiddish language and literature were encouraged; thousands of Yiddish books were published; many hundreds of Jewish schools were established, graduating scores of thousands; and a wide range of other educational, cultural and communal institutions and enterprises thrived—among them, periodicals, repertory theatres, research institutes. Decimated by the impact of the Great Purge, the last of the Jewish institutions were utterly wiped out by Stalin's violent anti-Semitic purge during the last five years of his life.

The glory that was Russian Jewry is no more. In this context, the sharp contrast with the situation of the Germans emerges most brutally. Soviet Jews have no counterparts of the institutions and prerogatives increasingly enjoyed by the Soviet Germans. Most decisive, of course, is the total absence of any form of Jewish education.

But perhaps most symbolic of the contrast is the character and role of the chief publication of each. As indicated, *Neues Leben* has become the champion of Soviet German culture and education, the central address for the German minority. The only Jewish publication, the monthly *Sovietish Heimland,* is undoubtedly on a higher literary level. But as a communal institution with pride and courage, providing leadership and drive for the future—it is non-existent. Its ineffectuality—nay, its irrelevance—as a spokesman for Soviet Jewish interests and needs is dramatically symbolized by the fact that it is the only Jewish publication in the world, in any language—indeed, the only Jewish Communist publication anywhere in the world—that failed to publish a translation of "Babi Yar," Yevgeni Yevtushenko's shattering 1961 poem condemning anti-Semitism. Its publication in Russia in 1961 struck a blow for Soviet Jews. But the only Soviet Jewish publication lacked the dignity, the pride, the self-respecting audacity, to follow these examples.

The explanation of the contrast between the character of *Neues Leben* and *Sovietish Heimland* is not to be sought in either the personality or the ideology of the respective editors. Rather, it can be found in Moscow's completely different policy objectives for these two national minorities. The Germans enjoy the support and approval of the authorities in their efforts to sustain and perpetuate their identity and culture. The Jews do not. It is this stark contrast that points up the bleak prospects of Soviet Jewry.

The Sympathetic Treatment Of the Armenians

THE ANALOGY BETWEEN THE ARMENIANS AND THE Jews is meaningful because of the similarity between the histories of the two peoples.

Both have ancient histories as *religious peoples,* with national-religious-historical ties to their ancient homelands, despite centuries of persecution and dispersion. Both ancient homelands were repeatedly overrun. In their dispersion, some in both peoples have become assimilated, but most others cling to their languages, cultures, national traditions—and, especially, their consciousness of identity. Many have profound religious and national attachments to the soil of their homeland, countries they have never seen—the places of their origin as a nation. In both instances, the majority of the people have lived outside their national motherland for generations.

It is within this context of great similarities that the contrast of Soviet policy toward the Armenians and toward the Jews emerges most sharply. For it is basic Soviet policy to encourage all the feelings of the Armenians as an entity—and to discourage and dissolve the similar feelings of the Jews.

Strengthening National Consciousness

The policy can be stated clearly and simply: No effort is spared to make the Armenians proud of their national heritage and to awaken their national consciousness. Coupled with that is the enormous effort expended to awaken the national consciousness among Armenians living abroad—in what both the Soviet authorities and the Armenian people call "the Diaspora" (another fascinating similarity with the Jews). Much work is done to stimulate the interest of the Diaspora Armenians in Soviet Armenia. And, perhaps most significant, a great and successful effort has been made for many years to "repatriate" Armenians from all over the world to their ancient "homeland."

In general, the basic approach is to try to instill in all Armenians the feeling that, no matter where they live, Armenians are one indivisible nation whose only homeland is Soviet Armenia.*

An extraordinary illustration of the kind of propaganda that is made comes in the following quotation from an article by an Armenian writer in a Soviet Russian-language magazine, *Ogonyok* (Number 15, April 1965). The article is about the Matenadaran, a great Armenian museum containing 10,000 ancient Armenian manuscripts and books:

> . . . From the moment of its inception, the Armenian book was more than a mere recording of events or the means of spreading literacy and culture. It was a weapon with which the nation fought for its independence and its nationality. . . .
>
> . . . If there had been need of a live illustration of the tragic history of Armenia, here it is—the history of the people's uprisings and defeats, of the short respites when culture and trade would hurriedly blossom like tulips in a desert, and then again torrents of blood would flood the country, and again universities, monasteries and towns would go up in flames; thousands of Armenians would leave their fatherland and would take their most precious treasure—the book—with them. . . .
>
> . . . Books, like warriors, shared the fate of the nation. They were burned on town squares, taken into bondage . . . But the Armenian people preserved its language and nationality in books, defended its history and its future. New libraries and new repositories for books arose in place of those destroyed. . . .
>
> . . . In the last forty years, the "population" of the Matenadaran has more than doubled. Books, like people, are returning to their homeland."

One need hardly do more than substitute the word "Jew" for the word "Armenian" in the above stirring passage to get the full import of it.

The Armenians, historically, are a religious nation, and that identification remains powerful to this day. Thus, the head of the Armenian Church, called the Catholicos, is viewed by all Armenians, and even by the Soviet Government, as the head of the whole people, at home and in the Diaspora†. His movements in and out of Armenia are fully covered by the Soviet press and radio.

There are three other Patriarchs of the Armenian Church, all subordinate to the Catholicos—in Beirut, Lebanon; in the Jordanian part of Jerusalem; and in Constantinople. There are some 35 bishops, ten in Armenia and elsewhere in the Soviet Union; the rest, scattered in the Diaspora. There are about 30 churches in Armenia, and about 60 more in the neighboring Soviet republics. In Etchmiadzin, there is a seminary, in operation since 1945, which has about 30 students; a few graduates have been sent to Western countries for higher education after ordination.

*There are approximately 4 million Armenians in the world. The 1959 Soviet Census lists 2,787,000 in the USSR, and, in the Armenian Republic itself, 1,552,000. 443,000 Armenians live in Georgia; 442,000 in Azerbaijan; 256,000 in the RSFSR (Russian Republic); 20,000 in the Turkmen Republic. Approximately one and a half million Armenians are scattered in the Middle East—chiefly Lebanon, Syria, Turkey and Iran—and in Western Europe and the United States.

†The seat of the Supreme Patriarch Catholicos of all Armenians is situated in Etchmiadzin, which is about ten miles west of Yerevan, capital of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

What happens to the Church in Soviet Armenia is of deep concern to all Armenians because for long centuries, when the people lived in subjugation on their native soil under alien tyranny as well as when they were widely dispersed under persecution, the Church was the only unifying, sustaining and guiding force. Many Armenians still consider the Church charged with that responsibility. Even the Government somehow views the Church as a bridge uniting the Armenian nation across many frontiers.

The Thriving Church

There is no regular atheist publication in Armenia. Articles against the Church and religion in general in Armenian newspapers and magazines are very rare. Many deeply religious texts of ancient Armenian literature are studied, translated into the current Armenian vernacular and published as historical classical literature.

The Catholicos presides over a sumptuous headquarters compound made available to him by the Government, and also supported and enhanced by Armenian religious communities abroad as well as inside the country. In that headquarters, the Catholicos owns a printing press and an up-to-date print shop. It publishes a monthly magazine circulated both in Armenia and in the Diaspora, in 3,000 copies in each area. It contains homiletical material, historical and literary articles and a chronicle of current events.

The Catholicos has paid a number of extensive visits in recent years to the Diaspora communities, especially in the Middle East, creating immense enthusiasm everywhere.

Baptisms are frequent. Marriages are blessed in the homes of the faithful. Burials are secular, but the faithful call the priest a day or a week later to the grave, for a blessing. Pilgrimages to ancient shrines are common, people traveling long distances, often in groups, for this end.

Small groups congregate in homes for Bible readings and prayers. Preaching in churches is regular. Bishops openly visit their parishes periodically. Financially, the churches are able to take care of their own needs; money is collected inside the churches during the services, but the main source of income is from the performance of sacraments and rituals, and from the sales of candles.

In short, the Church thrives, with official support, and continues to play a key role in the life of the Armenian people at home and in the Diaspora.

All the above far from exhausts the scope of support given to keeping alive Armenian national consciousness and culture. Armenian national pride and consciousness are kept alive in a great many ways. Propaganda is one of the most important—especially in a country where all publication is government controlled. In this case, official propaganda works in only one direction—that of encouraging the Armenian nation to live. To cite one illustrative quotation from *Kommunist,* the Russian-language weekly published in Yerevan, on November 30, 1965:

> . . . We note with pride that the pogromists have not succeeded in their aims. Like the phoenix of the fairy tale, the Armenian nation has arisen from its ashes, has matured, has become the master of its own fate. . . .

Would that Soviet publications would write like this about the martyrdom and revival of the Jewish people in the 20th century!

Scope of Support

Among the means used by the Government to arouse Armenian pride is to encourage knowledge of the Armenian past. Contrast this with the Jews: For example, in the Armenian Republic, there are 19 museums containing more than 350,000 items about Armenian history, science and culture. The manuscripts of more than 500 Armenian writers can be viewed in the museum of literature and art. Most of these old documents have been received from various institutions in Europe, Asia and the Americas. One such museum, the Matenadaran, as we noted, contains 10,000 ancient Armenian manuscripts and books.

The museums are very popular with local residents and visitors from abroad. In 1964, they were visited by over 650,000 people.

Equally important is the publication of important books. Among them the following must be noted: The Armenian Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography is preparing two volumes—an archaeological atlas and an ethnographic atlas of Armenia. The Armenian Academy of Science is preparing three enormous sets of immense literary-cultural significance for Armenians: a four-volume *History of the Armenian People;* a multi-volume *History of Modern Armenian Literature;* and a ten-volume *Armenian National Encyclopedia.*

In commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the victory over Germany in World War II, the Armenian Academy of Science published a *Book of Heroes,* containing 95 biographical sketches of Armenian "Heroes of the Soviet Union." (Though the Jews were fourth in total number of such decorated Soviet citizens, no such honor has even been done them.)

It should be noted that all the above, as well as much ordinary literature, is published in the Armenian language. But it should also be pointed out that a great deal of the propaganda of encouragement for Armenian national pride appears in Russian-language newspapers and periodicals all over the country, including the three leading Soviet papers of Moscow (*Pravda, Izvestia* and *Trud*); *Ogonyok,* an important

magazine in Moscow; and the official newspapers of Tbilisi (*Zarya Vostoka*) and Baku (*Bakinsky Rabochy*). The significance of this fact should not be underestimated: It means, simply but dramatically, that the entire Soviet reading populace is constantly given to understand that Armenian national consciousness and national pride are a matter of official Soviet support.

In other words, it is a good thing, a very good thing, to be an Armenian in the USSR. But to be a Jew. . . . ?

"Hello, Homeland!"

As an Armenian folk-saying has it: "To be a king in your fatherland is good, to be a beggar is also good —as long as it is in your own fatherland."

For many years, Soviet Armenia, the Soviet Government and their propaganda, and organizational apparatuses have been encouraging emigration of Armenian "colonies" living in "alien" countries—back to the Armenian homeland. Two official bodies have had the main responsibilities in this area: the Committee for Cultural Ties with Compatriots in the Diaspora, and the Committee for the Reception and Settlement of Armenians Returning from the Diaspora.

More than 200,000 have been "repatriated" from "foreign" countries in the past four decades; their families now exceed 30,000. The vast majority never saw Armenia before. They came, as one Armenian source put it, " . . . to live in the mother country, to speak their native language, to develop their national culture."

A messianic tone characterizes the repatriation propaganda. There is constant repetition of such phrases as: "the land of our fathers," "fatherland," "motherland," "homeland," "return to native soil," "our wanderings are at an end."

A Jew observing the debarkation of new immigrants to Israel would immediately recognize the sentiments expressed by an Armenian journalist, Gurgen Boryan, in an article in *Pravda,* January 12, 1966, entitled, "Hello, Homeland!" He reports his observation of the arrival of the Soviet ship, "Armenia," at a Soviet port:

> . . . Aboard this ship there were many Armenians once doomed to the cruel fate of a life far away from the homeland, who had built nests on foreign soil under foreign skies, people in whose hearts a song of yearning had always sounded, in whose eyes there always lived the reflection of a cherished dream—to see the new, reborn Armenia.
>
> And now they are arriving, from great distances, in Soviet Armenia, some to live permanently, some to see relatives, some as tourists, simply to soothe the yearning for their native land and to enjoy the sweet "smoke of the fatherland."
>
> . . . Soviet Armenia has today become that promised land upon which are fixed the eyes of the Armenians scattered all over the world, that sacred land, that holy land to which their yesterdays are bound. Nearly 200,000 Armenians have returned to Armenia. This is a historical process of gathering and uniting a nation. . . .

Such quotations could be multiplied by the hundred.

It is the concern for national preservation and national future which the Soviet Government honors and encourages for the Armenians—especially through its intensive effort at repatriation to the motherland.

Repatriates have come from all over—Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iran, Cyprus, Greece, Latin America, France, the United States, and other Western countries. In addition, the Armenian "colonies" all over the world support the homeland by contributions of funds and other means. (The modern printing press of the Armenian Catholicos was a gift from Armenians in the United States.)

The government understands the importance of attracting the young generation of foreign Armenians to the idea of "returning to the land of their ancestors." For this purpose, great efforts are expended in making close contact with Armenian schools in the Diaspora. For example, there are many foreign Armenians studying at universities in Yerevan.

Soviet Armenian committees have ties with Armenian cultural, youth, public and other organizations, groups and individuals in 32 countries. Another key to the future is the systematic program for teachers in Armenian schools abroad to come to Soviet Armenia for postgraduate work.

It is worth noting that, in 1964-65 alone, 163 schools in 20 foreign countries received 42,000 copies of eight Armenian textbooks, 10,000 copies of 200 works of Armenian literature; as well as music, newspapers and magazines, and albums of photographs illustrating the achievements of Soviet Armenia.

There can be no question of the intense special feeling of large numbers of Soviet Jews for Israel, the ancient homeland and Holy Land of the Jewish people. These Soviet Jews have a deep feeling of Jewishness, a feeling for Jewish history, a feeling about the common destiny of the Jewish people and the role of its historic homeland in that destiny. These feelings are part of the natural traditional legacy passed down through the centuries to the Jews who live on Soviet soil today.

It is not too much to ask that the Soviet Government, which so sympathetically understands such ancient feelings, associations and yearnings as are understanding for identical feelings held for an even expressed by the Armenians, should show no less longer time by the Jews.

Inner Tensions:
The English-Speaking Communists Protest

DURING 1966, POWERFUL VOICES CRITICAL OF SOVIET policy toward the Jews emerged from the Communist parties of the three great English-speaking countries —Britain, Australia and the United States. The first was an official statement by the Executive Committee of the British Communist Party. The second was an interview given by Rex Mortimer, a leading member of the Central Committee of the Australian party. And the third took the form of a Draft Resolution presented for discussion by the leadership of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. (CPUSA).

All three, of course, proffer comradely loyalty to the Soviet Union and express friendship and praise for Soviet policies and objectives, although the tone of those expressions ranges from cool and formal to warm and cordial. By the same token, the criticism voiced by the three ranges from the timid and tepid to the sharp and clear; but, in all cases, the criticism is unmistakable.

Their significance is not only that these are Communists who find it necessary to criticize the USSR but that they are at once a product and a reflection of the ferment inside all Communist parties in the Western world on this great moral-intellectual question. All this activity, generated by the painfully incontrovertible facts, cannot but have, within the fluid and unpredictable polycentrism that now characterizes the world Communist movement, an expanding and perhaps persuasive impact on Moscow.

* * *

(Statement adopted by the Executive Committee of the British Communist Party, May 23, 1966)

From its inception the Communist Party of Great Britain has consistently campaigned against anti-Semitism in any form.

It has conducted a consistent battle against all forms of discrimination, showing how they arise out of class society and that the ultimate solution to anti-Semitism, as to all other forms of racial, national or religious discrimination, will be found in a classless socialist society.

The experiences in the Soviet Union throughout the years have borne this out.

The old Czarist Empire was known as the prison house of nations. It was the worst hot-bed of anti-Semitism in the world at that time. When it was overthrown and capitalism was ended, giant strides were taken in resolving the national problem and eradicating anti-Semitism.

The crimes against socialist democracy between 1948 and 1953 had an adverse effect on Soviet Jews, as in many other fields of democracy, and retarded the process of eliminating all forms of discrimination in the Soviet Union.

But, despite this, there can be no doubt that greater progress has been made in the Soviet Union in eliminating anti-Semitism than anywhere else in the world.

We welcome the measures taken in the Soviet Union since 1953 to redress wrongs which arose in the 1948-1953 period, measures such as the setting up of a Yiddish Publishing House; publication of at first a bi-monthly and now a monthly Yiddish journal, *Sovietish Heimland,* and a number of Yiddish books; a big increase in the publication of mass editions of Yiddish literature translated into Russian and many other languages; the organization of a number of dramatic and concert groups and Yiddish readers' and writers' conferences; the preparation of a Yiddish-Russian dictionary, and the criticism by the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. of the notorious Kichko book and its withdrawal from circulation.

The Executive Committee, however, considers that it is impossible to take the view that in the historically short period of less than half a century, every vestige of anti-Semitism among the population could be eliminated. Remnants of anti-Semitism remain amongst individuals as do remnants of other reactionary ideas and attitudes against which there is and must be a continuous struggle.

In the light of this, the Executive Committee asks the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to give sympathetic consideration to the following points in addition to all that has been done: that the ideological struggle against the remnants of anti-Semitism be improved; that greater care should be exercised in the conducting of ideological work on religion and nationalism so as to avoid impermissible crudities which have nothing to do with a principled Marxist position and which could be exploited by anti-Semites to further anti-Semitism. Our January Executive Committee statement pointed out that religious freedom implies facilities to obtain ritual articles associated with religious worship. In this respect it would appear to us that facilities for the obtaining of some such articles are still insufficient.

We understand of course that the solution of these matters lies with the Soviet authorities. We make these suggestions in a fraternal way because what happens in the USSR on all such questions is of the deepest interest to Communists everywhere.

* * *

(Observations by Rex Mortimer, Australian Communist Party leader, in an interview with Isi Leiber, an official of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, November 11, 1966)

One of the most inexcusable things is the continued

circulation of various anti-Semitic publications and the failure on the part of the Soviet authorities to prosecute those who have written and distributed such anti-Semitic material. As the Communist parties of the United States, Great Britain and Australia have all pointed out, it is imperative that a Government-sponsored campaign be initiated against anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. There is as yet no sign that the Soviet authorities recognize this. It is unsatisfactory to dismiss these pernicious symptoms as hangovers from the past. A Socialist Government has a bounden duty to campaign actively against any racialist manifestations in the community. Where racialism or anti-Semitism find organized and even official expression, then the Soviet leaders cannot disown responsibility for them.

Although in the recent period there have been instances of the relaxation of some disabilities affecting Jews, none of these touch the basic institutional inequalities Jews suffer with regard to religious, educational and cultural rights. It is appropriate in this context to point out that frequent reference has rightly been made to the contrasting facilities accorded to the Soviet German minority on the one hand, and Jewish citizens on the other. To my mind, there can be no justification for the continuation of this discrimination.

At the present time a serious crisis has arisen in relations between Israel and some Arab countries. It is an area in which one would expect the Soviet Union's prestige and influence to be strongly exercised on the side of peaceful negotiations. However, to my great disappointment, the general intransigence by the Soviet leadership on the Jewish question again expresses itself clearly, in the Soviet Government's attitude towards Israel. As the Israeli Communist Party has stated, the Soviet Government's position ignores the inflammatory attitudes of those Arab leaders who continually state their intention of destroying the State of Israel. At the same time, of course, the Israeli Government must exercise maximum restraint in its relations with Arab countries.

As the Communist Party of Australia has stated, Zionism and Communism are opposed. However, the natural inclination of many Soviet Jewish citizens to have contact with and follow the progress of their kinsmen in Israel is surely both understandable and legitimate. Such an affinity by Soviet Jews in no way implies support for the political policies of the Government of the time in Israel. Communists cannot consistently condemn the United States for its quarantine policies towards Cuba, and at the same time accept the fact that individual Soviet Jews are harassed and accused of subversion for any interest shown to Israel, or for maintaining contact with visiting Israeli tourists.

It appeared for a time last year, following information conveyed to the Communist Party of Australia delegation by spokesmen of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that some genuine liberalization of Soviet policy with regard to the emigration of Jews was imminent. However, this has failed to eventuate to any significant extent and indeed there is evidence that administrative obstacles and pressures are being exerted to prevent Jews from even applying for exit permits to join families in Israel and elsewhere.

In many ways the status of Jews in the Soviet Union, like that of Negroes in the United States, is a barometer of the health of the society. As a Communist and one who recognizes the great contribution of the Soviet Union to social progress, I am convinced that all progressives must continue to express their point of view on this question until the injustices have been remedied.

The U.S. Communist Party Statement

Any statement on the Soviet Jewish question that issues from the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is bound to have a greater influence in the international movement and in Moscow itself than might be expected considering its small size—because, for a variety of reasons, the U.S. Party wields disproportionately great weight in Communist councils the world over. For this reason, the Draft Resolution now being debated inside this party deserves closest attention.

It should be noted that this is a Draft Resolution "On The Jewish Question," of which only Section IV (of a total of five sections) deals with Soviet Jewry. The Draft was published in the August 1966 issue of *Political Affairs,* the monthly ideological organ of the Party. It was presented for debate by the members, who were informed that a special Party Conference would be held in November 1966 to adopt a final version. Soon thereafter came the announcement of the postponement of that meeting, for which no new date has yet been set.

There can be no doubt that even in draft form this statement is an unprecedently frank critique of Soviet policy. In between the fraternal friendship and the comradely lip-service, behind the evasions, omissions and half-truths—there stands forth the clear expression of pained protest, which, however indirect it may appear to outsiders, will hit the mark straight and hard for Communists the world over and especially for Moscow.

Thus this Draft is a remarkable step forward and it must be welcomed as such. At the same time, since it also addresses the rest of the world, it must surely also be evaluated not just by Communist standards but by normal criteria of truth and justice. But first, here is the text of Section IV:

There is . . . a deep interest among American Jews in the life of Jews in the socialist countries, above all in the Soviet Union. The socialist solution of the national question in the Soviet Union, and especially the transformed status of Soviet Jews and the unprecedented flourishing of Jewish culture in the twenties and thirties, won a sympathetic response from almost all sections of American Jewry. This was enhanced by the Soviet measures during World War II which saved millions of Jews from Hitlerite extermination, and by the outstanding role played by the Soviet Union in the establishment of the State of Israel.

The news of the suppression of Jewish cultural institutions and executions of cultural figures during the Stalin regime served to alienate considerable sections of the Jewish people in the United States who had previously been active supporters of Soviet-American friendship. It also gave new impetus to the cold-war elements

in this country in their unending anti-Soviet campaigns under the banner of "Soviet anti-Semitism."

This slogan is a slander and an outright fraud, which must be rejected and fought. Not only is there no official policy of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, but anti-Semitism and all other forms of national discrimination (or privileges) are prohibited by the Constitution of the USSR. Jews are actively participating in the building of socialism. They are to be found in the government, the army, industry, the arts and sciences. While the Jewish nationality in the USSR occupies eleventh place in size of population, it occupies third place in the number of scientists, exceeded only by the Russians and Ukrainians. Jewish university students exceed in numbers those of the Uzbek and Georgian Republics, which are much larger sections of the Soviet population. The same may be shown in other areas of social and economic participation.

Today, as in the past, the Soviet Union is the staunchest champion of peace and human freedom in the world. The interests of the Jewish people, certainly no less than those of any other people, lie in seeking friendship with the Soviet Union and in combatting anti-Sovietism.

The fraudulent slogan of "Soviet anti-Semitism" is grist to the mill of the cold-war forces fighting the Soviet Union as a bulwark of world peace and as the world's first land of socialism. These have launched an intensive campaign designed to undermine the U.S.-Soviet relations and to promote a policy of aggression and war. In this campaign they have sought to utilize every error, every shortcoming which may occur in the process of erasing the results of the crimes of the Stalin period and restoring Jewish cultural institutions in order to mislead many honest people, even some leading figures in the civil rights and peace movements. The existence of such shortcomings as the crude, fallacious anti-religious propaganda embodied in books of the Kichko or Schakhnowitz varieties, in continued limitations (such as lack of prayer books) experienced by religious Jewish people, the absence of a campaign against persistent expressions of remnants of anti-Semitism, the slowness of restoration of Jewish culture, have enabled the cold-war instigators of the campaign to meet with a considerable degree of success in these efforts.

In the past several years, substantial advances have been recorded in the return to Leninist norms in this area. Anti-religious books of the Kichko type have been withdrawn. Premier Kosygin has spoken out against anti-Semitism in his Riga speech of August 1965, and an editorial in Pravda on September 5, 1965, called attention to Lenin's position against anti-Semitism. These are welcome beginnings of a campaign against remnants of anti-Semitism.

The Yiddish magazine *Sovietish Heimland,* established toward the end of 1961, has been recording continued growth, and has become an outstanding Jewish cultural institution. Yiddish books have been appearing, although at a slow pace. Yiddish concerts are given in many Soviet cities with record attendances. Some 213 books by Yiddish writers were translated into Russian and other languages between 1955 and 1964, with a total circulation of over 26 million copies.

While emphasizing these advances, we look forward to the continuation of the process now under way and its progress toward full restoration of the administratively suppressed Jewish cultural institutions. We support the approach expressed in the editorials in *Political Affairs* of June and July 1964 with reference to combatting remnants of anti-Semitism in the USSR, the approach to religion and anti-religious propaganda, and for the restoration of such institutions as a Jewish state theatre, Yiddish newspapers, education, and other means of Jewish culture.

* * *

The weaknesses and contradictions of the Draft are manifest. It states that a process is going on to restore Jewish cultural institutions. But, of course, no such process is visible. The few Jewish enterprises—the monthly literary journal, the handful of Yiddish books, the dozen or so wandering professional artists—regardless of their inherent worth, are not institutions but mere isolated items.

Thus the Draft surely knowingly grossly misstates the case when it says that "Yiddish books have been appearing, although at a slow pace." The fact is that precisely nine books have appeared since 1959. In 1948, the last year of Jewish book publication before Stalin destroyed the Yiddish publishing house and the Hebrew typeface, not less than sixty Yiddish books were published.

The Draft says, "Yiddish concerts are given in many Soviet cities with record attendances." This is true, and welcome. But the fact is that these concerts —whose record attendances, in the hundreds of thousands annually, are only another of the many indications of the great Soviet Jewish hunger for cultural and communal life—have been drawing such audiences for a decade. It serves neither truth nor justice to cite them as evidence of a current, expanding process of the restoration of Jewish institutions.

Nor does it serve truth and justice to refer to the policy of cultural deprivation and forcible assimilation in such euphemistic terms as "errors" and "shortcomings." These are profound injustices, and the Draft fails to face up to that fact when it calls for policy changes, not in order to redress terrible wrongs, but to prevent "cold-war instigators" from taking advantage of the glaring inadequacies of Soviet policy.

It is completely misleading for the Draft to suggest that a campaign was initiated by Soviet Premier Kosygin and *Pravda,* a year ago July and September respectively, against anti-Semitism. It looked that way at first, but since September 1965 there has been no further word from the Kremlin. And althought it is true that "anti-religious books of the Kichko type have been withdrawn," the authors of the Draft either neglect or are unaware of the fact that, after a hiatus of about a year and a half, new materials tainted with anti-Semitic tones and innuendoes have begun to reappear.

Nevertheless, despite these lacunae and lapses, the Draft Resolution remains a major step forward, and if the CPUSA ultimately adopts a version which is not weakened, and which is perhaps even stronger, it will have struck a blow for the rendering of justice to the Jews of Russia.

Findings and Judgment Of the Ad Hoc Commission On the Rights of Soviet Jews

THIS AD HOC COMMISSION ON THE RIGHTS OF SOVIET Jews convened in New York City on March 18, 1966.

We were moved to constitute ourselves into a board of inquiry because we believe, simply, that the three million Jews of the Soviet Union have an especial claim on the conscience of mankind.

That claim rests above all on the fact that they represent the last great remnant of that vast, spiritually prolific East European Jewish community which was destroyed by the Nazis. Those who survived deserve the right to work out their destiny unmolested, with humanity's troubled heart on guard for them as it was not for the others.

They are heir to a rich millenial culture on Russian soil, from which sprang social idealism, the love of truth, the thirst for artistic beauty, and hunger for knowledge. That culture's leaven still ferments and stimulates, still goads and inspires, not only Jews, and not only in Eastern Europe but in the United States and wherever else their offspring and kin took root.

That culture and its creators, we believe, should not be allowed to suffocate and expire.

The Witnesses

In the course of a long day, we took testimony from the following ten witnesses:

PROFESSOR ERIC GOLDHAGEN, Director, Institute of East European Jewish Affairs, Brandeis University.

DR. WILLIAM BRICKMAN, Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania.

RABBI ISRAEL MILLER, then president of the Rabbinical Council of America, who led a group of rabbis on a visit to the USSR in the summer of 1965.

REV. THURSTON DAVIS, S.J., editor-in-chief of the Jesuit weekly, *America*, who in early 1966 visited the USSR on an interdenominational mission to study the state of religious liberty there.

DR. DAVID W. WEISS, Professor of Bacteriology, University of California (Berkeley), who in mid-1965 participated in an international scientific conference in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Academy of Medical Science.

MEYER LEVIN, novelist, author of *The Old Bunch*, *Compulsion* and many other novels, who discovered and introduced *The Diary of Anne Frank* to the United States; a private visitor to the USSR in 1966.

DR. JUDD L. TELLER, a scholar in Soviet affairs, author of *The Kremlin, the Jews and the Middle East* and *Scapegoat of Revolution*.

MAURICE SAMUEL, historian and essayist, author of two classic literary-cultural studies of East European and Russian Jewish life—*The World of Sholem Aleichem* and *Prince of the Ghetto*—and of *Blood Accusation*, the just published history of the Mendel Beiliss case dealing with anti-Semitism in Tsarist Russia.

MAX HAYWARD, Senior Fellow, St. Anthony's College, Oxford University; authority on Soviet literature and intellectual life; translator of *Doctor Zhivago* and *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*.

AN ANONYMOUS WITNESS, an American-born woman who lived in the USSR for thirty years and only recently returned to the United States.

Before, during and after that day of public hearings, we had ample opportunity to examine carefully voluminous factual, documentary and analytic studies and materials, as well as to ponder the testimony and the replies of witnesses to our queries. It might be well at the outset to present a brief statement of our conclusions.

Summary Findings

We find that an overwhelmingly persuasive and irrefutable case has been made out. The future of Soviet Jewry is in grave jeopardy. The tragedy of Soviet Jewry can be stated succinctly:

Cut off from its past, atomized from within, isolated from its brethren abroad, bereft of educational institutions, subjected to a wide range of discriminatory deprivations in culture, religion, education, employment and public life, the Soviet Jewish community is being denied its natural right of group existence and its basic human right of meaningful identity.

Alone among the officially recognized religions of

the USSR, Jews are forbidden any form of nation-wide federation of synagogues or rabbis—the kind of instrumentality by which all other religious groups are legally enabled to maintain close contact within their communion, to produce, sell and distribute religious publications and articles, and to establish organizational bonds with coreligionists abroad.

Alone among Soviet nationalities, the Jews are forbidden any form of cultural, communal and educational institution and activity through which all other nationalities—with official sanction and support—preserve and enhance their heritage, and bolster the individual pride and dignity of their members.

Alone among Soviet nationalities, Jews are the victims of a subtle but inexorable policy of attrition which aims at what Communists outside the USSR have themselves repeatedly castigated as "forcible assimilation": the ineluctable attenuation and eradication—through painless but nonetheless effectual means—of the Jewish group.

With alarm and sorrow we are compelled to state that the ancient People of the Book is, in the Soviet Union, deprived of its books and even of its alphabet—for it has not even a primer from which to learn it. Thus denied, Soviet Jewry is being forced to surrender its character, its dignity and its future.

Soviet Jews As A Nationality

The concept of nationality is an ethnic-cultural-historical concept of crucial importance in the USSR, where more than one hundred different nationalities, large and small, coexist. The concept involves group kinship associations and close ties to the group's history, language, literature, heroes, folkways, mores, traditions and aspirations—all within a pervasive psychological-moral ambience.

Soviet ideology, Constitution, law and practice encourage the many nationalities—whether territorially concentrated or dispersed—to perpetuate their group existence through cultural, educational and communal institutions and activities in their own languages.

Soviet Jewry is officially designated a nationality. Soviet Jews are not Russians or Ukrainians or Bielorussians, although they have mastered the language—chiefly Russian—of the peoples among whom they live, and although they made creative contributions in those languages and cultural milieux. They remain Jews, and both Soviet law and public opinion so regard them.

Thus there is nothing intrinsically anti-Semitic or discriminatory, for example, about the mere fact of the listing of Jewish nationality in the Jew's internal passport. (All Soviet citizens must list their nationalities this way.) On the contrary, the fact of the national character of all of East European Jewry is deeply ingrained in the consciousness of Jews and non-Jews alike in that part of the world.

So the listing of Jews as a nationality in fact reflects the reality there—no less than the definition of the Jews of the United States as a religious community reflects the present reality of life in America, as felt both objectively and subjectively by Jews and non-Jews alike here.

In the first three decades of Soviet rule, it should be noted, the State supported a wide network of cultural, educational, artistic, journalistic, communal and research institutions for the Jews in Yiddish, the spoken tongue of the masses. (Hebrew had been banned as the language of "reactionary clericalism" and of "bourgeois nationalism"—i.e., Zionism.) These institutions began to be destroyed in the late 1930s. In 1948-49 this process of liquidation was completed. In 1952 some twenty-four leading Jewish cultural figures were executed on trumped-up charges.

Yet after half a century of Soviet rule, and despite nearly two decades without these cultural institutions, the Jews of the USSR—among them large segments of the youth—still retain their profound self-awareness as a distinct national group, with a legitimate pride in their ancestral heritage (even though many no longer know its contents); with the powerful yearning traditional to the Jews for knowledge of their past and for communal bonds with fellow Jews elsewhere, and with common aspirations for the future.

Jewish Culture

Jewish culture, once so flourishing in the USSR, is now represented by the merest tokens. There is one monthly literary journal. A grand total of nine Yiddish books (five by masters long since dead) have been published since 1959. There are about a dozen professional actors and folk singers who wander about the country, without a theatre of their own, presenting programs of Jewish dramatic readings and music. There are amateur theatrical groups in several cities. A few years ago, a Hebrew-Russian dictionary was published—obviously unusable by any Soviet Jew below the age of sixty or sixty-five, since the study of Hebrew has been banned since the Revolution.

Whatever their intrinsic merit—and some of them are very good indeed—these tokens are surely incapable of providing the kind of cultural nourishment needed by large numbers of Jews who desire as full a secular cultural life as is possible, and who are eager to salvage something of the Jewish cultural heritage for their children.

There is no professional Jewish theatre, nor a school to train theatre workers. There is no publishing house, nor any book-distributing agency. There is no daily or weekly newspaper, nor any other printed means by which Soviet Jews might learn what is going on among their fellow Jews at home or abroad. There is no research institute, nor any research or teaching

department for any kind of Jewish historical, social scientific, linguistic or literary studies in any university. There are no generally available Jewish history books, in any language. There are no textbooks for any Jewish subject; not only does the regime forbid the publication of any sort of Jewish text, but it frowns upon their receipt from abroad.

The Jews are the only Soviet nationality that is permitted no history, no culture, no education. This is the extent of Jewish cultural life in the USSR today.

Jewish Religion

Soviet authorities recognize that a substantial number of Jews are still religious. But the USSR is an ideologically atheist country. It prohibits all religious education under the age of eighteen, discourages all religious faith and conducts massive anti-religious propaganda. In these circumstances, Soviet spokesmen contend there has been a steady, natural loss of interest in all religions, as the atheist viewpoint has come to prevail. In no respect, they claim, does Judaism suffer any disabilities not faced by all other religions.

Although there certainly has been a substantial diminution of faith and although all religions have surely suffered greatly over the decades, every competent observer of the Soviet scene in recent years has been struck by evidence of a reverse process. More and more young people attend church services, either to pray or out of curiosity. Of great potential consequence for the future is the remarkable and growing influx of young people into the Christian clergy. Vigorous, new, young leadership is arising in the Moslem religious community as well.

But this situation does not describe Jewish religious life. The sad fact is that Judaism is subjected to much harsher and more severe treatment than any other religion.

The others are endowed with a fairly wide range of institutions, churches, seminaries, monasteries, functionaries and organizational prerogatives, so that, comparatively speaking, they all thrive. For example, all the others—the Russian Orthodox, the Churches of Armenia and Georgia, the Lutherans of the Baltic republics, the Moslems, even the three million Baptists who are dispersed all over the country—are permitted nationwide organizations of their congregations and clergy. Through these key agencies, they maintain mutual contact and communication, bolster the morale of the faithful, produce, sell and distribute religious publications and articles, and, not least, join international bodies of their coreligionists abroad (World Council of Churches, European Council of Churches, international denominational bodies and congresses, etc.), and exchange innumerable visits with them.

Even the meticulous restoration of certain churches, monasteries and mosques as historical monuments and artistic wonders—though not as places of worship—becomes a source of pride to the faithful. Beyond that, these restorations represent an unwitting invitation by the authorities to a questing younger generation to marvel at the mysterious contrast between the manifest beauty which believing ages were able to produce and the palpable dullness and mediocrity which many see as the characteristic dismal product of an atheistic period.

None of this is available to religious Jewry. No restoration of synagogues, no honor for the graves of distinguished Jewish spiritual figures. More serious, however, is the fact that religious Jews are forbidden any kind of nationwide federation or organization. This means that every one of the sixty-two known remaining synagogues is a congregation unto itself, with no formal contact with any of the others or with religious Jewry in other lands.

The synagogues are beset by restrictions—and so thoroughly infiltrated by informers and police agents who spread a miasma of fear—that bespeak an official intention to liquidate Judaism as speedily as possible. Massive synagogue closures and bans on private prayer meetings in the past few years in a host of cities have deprived many Jews of their last place of worship, and even the barest opportunity for communal prayer.

However, since the forcible closure of the sole rabbinical seminary—the Moscow *yeshivah*—in 1962, all education and training of a new generation of rabbis has come to a halt. Old rabbis die or retire and there are no replacements. This is in striking contrast to the privileges other denominations enjoy, of either maintaining seminaries inside the country or sending young seminarians to study abroad.

Jews are forbidden to publish indispensable religious books such as the Bible and prayerbooks, or to produce indispensable religious articles such as phylactaries and prayer shawls. The importation of all such items is also forbidden and their acceptance from visiting foreigners is severely condemned. Growing restrictions drastically impinge upon the most basic and ancient of sacred rites: circumcision has been largely abandoned through fear of censure or punishment; burial in consecrated ground is being gradually curtailed by administrative means; and the production and distribution of *matzoth* (unleavened bread for Passover), though more readily available in the last two years than theretofore, is still hedged about with technical difficulties and has not at all been eased outside of perhaps a dozen main cities.

Jews and Judaism in Anti-Religious Propaganda

"Scientific" anti-religious propaganda directed against Judaism goes far beyond the standard govern-

ment polemics aimed at the "false beliefs" of the other religions. All too frequently such propaganda is rife with hatred of the Jew and contempt for the Jewish heritage; ancient anti-Semitic stereotypes are dredged up and given currency. The Bible is besmirched, Jewish history, heroes and traditions have become the objects of vilification. Even political suspicions about Judaism's beliefs and practices are aroused.

The whole of Judaism, past and present, wherever it has existed, is portrayed as one long, uninterrupted chain of filth, crime, exploitation, bloodthirstiness, hypocrisy, lust for profit, and a Nazi-like belief in Jewish "racial" superiority. In the mass mind, therefore, the "Jew" of Judaism and the "Jew" on the street tend to be seen as one and the same. Thus is created and nurtured an atmosphere in which popular anti-Semitism is seemingly encouraged, and certainly not discouraged, from above.

Discrimination in Higher Education and Employment

For many years there has been a subtly exercised policy of discrimination against Jews in higher education and employment. Although it is extremely difficult to prove, the fact of such discrimination is common knowledge in the USSR. Despite the rigid quotas and other exclusionary policies they must overcome, Jews seeking a higher education manage to get it one way or another. Once admitted to advanced training, Jews must do better than others to remain.

Jews do quite well in many sectors of employment. They are well represented in many natural and social sciences, engineering and other technical fields, State commercial enterprises, journalism and the arts, medicine and law.

But with exceedingly few exceptions, they cannot reach the highest level to which their talents might otherwise normally lead them. In addition, Jews are totally excluded from the decisive policy-making and power-wielding positions in virtually all "security-sensitive" areas of public life: the Communist Party hierarchy, the Government (especially the Foreign Ministry and other offices with relationships outside the country), the armed forces and their ancillary agencies, and the top-secret scientific-military enterprises.

Conclusions

Such a wholesale assault not only deprives Soviet Jews of their rights as individuals and as members of a group, but affronts their self-respect, besmirches their honor, and lowers their dignity among their non-Jewish neighbors. Thus is an ancient and illustrious community ground down.

This historic violation of human rights—the enforced cultural and spiritual disintegration of so vast and creative a community, coming as it does on the heels of the Jewish tragedy during World War II—is a prospect which no person of conscience can view with equanimity.

Indeed, many individuals of international repute have more than once given vent to their profound concern about the fate of Soviet Jewry. Among many other champions of peace and justice, we might mention four Nobel Laureates: Bertrand Russell, François Mauriac, the the Albert Schweitzer, and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Especially significant is the fact that the plight of Soviet Jewry has been recognized—and protested—by Communist parties and leaders in Britain, France, Italy, the United States, Latin America and Australia.

We believe that responsible, sober expressions of conscience, when put forward systematically and steadily, will have a growing impact on Soviet policy-makers, and for a least two major reasons: (1) Because, the leaders of the USSR have become far more susceptible to world opinion; and (2) Because, as they depart increasingly from irrational and illiberal modes of thought and action and move toward greater rationality and a gradual expansion of liberality, Soviet officials grow ever more sensitive to the moral demands of their own literary and scientific intelligentsia. Finally, as they draw closer to the Western world and seek expanding cultural, academic and commercial contacts with it, they necessarily become more vulnerable to world public opinion.

It is within such a context that we deem it desirable to make the following recommendations:

Recommendations

A Great Power such as the Soviet Union, precisely because it presents itself to the world as a revolutionary force that seeks to enhance the dignity of man, must surely accept a basic obligation toward certain fundamental individual and group rights.

Among these is the natural human right of a historic people, such as the Jews, to perpetuate its group life and culture. Closely linked with that is another basic human right—the right of individuals to find self-realization through their natural kinship with such a group.

Many individual Soviet Jews have assimilated into the national cultures of the Russian, the Ukrainian or other nationality in the USSR, and have made honorable contributions to those cultures. No one can quarrel with, or gainsay, their right to have taken that path.

Yet there can be little doubt that a vast number of Soviet Jews would choose, in one form or another, to exercise their natural right to group life and the

equally natural right to seek self-fulfillment through their group.

These are, in fact, rights which the Soviet Union accepts as cardinal principles of its domestic and foreign policies, frequently subsumed under the heading of the right to national self-determination. What we ask for the Jews is simply these basic rights in practice and not just in principle. What we seek is that Jewish rights be observed no less than those of all other Soviet national and religious minorities.

For many Soviet Jews, this would mean the opportunity to perform their religious duties and maintain religious associations without administrative hindrances.

For a much larger number of Jews, this would mean the opportunity to establish—with the kind of support and encouragement which the USSR gives to all other nationalities—cultural, educational, communal and artistic institutions that would assure to succeeding generations a knowledge of Jewish history, literature, languages, culture and traditions.

And for those Soviet Jews who can find self-realization only in a Jewish State, this would mean the right to leave the USSR in order to create a new Jewish life for themselves in Israel. This could well begin by opening the doors to the emigration of those thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living abroad, families that were shattered in ghettoes and extermination camps of the Nazi era.

These are rights which Jews possess in virtually all countries of the world. It is their absence in the USSR which causes such deep concern and which has given rise to the protests which will surely not cease until this tragic injustice is rectified.

The Soviet Union owes it to world public opinion, to itself and to its Jewish citizens, to bring its policy toward the Jewish nationality into line with its vaunted image as a power dedicated to human rights; into line with the evolving rationality that is gradually being brought to bear on many other aspects of Soviet life. Such an imaginative and liberal policy would have a dramatic impact on world opinion, which would correctly see in it the fitting gesture of a great power to redress a wrong and to do justice to an ancient people.

Sooner or later, it appears to us, the United States and the Soviet Union will seek to move systematically by the Soviet Union toward its Jewish citizens. Such harmony can only be impeded by the persistence of so irrational and cruel a policy as that practiced by the Soviet Union toward its Jewish citizens. On the other hand, the equitable resolution of this problem, through the restoration of equal rights for Soviet Jews, would remove a great moral, emotional and intellectual obstacle standing in the path of mutual understanding between our two countries.

We believe that history will judge all societies, ours as well as the Soviet, by the measure in which they make human rights truly meaningful in the life of men. It is in this spirit of basic human kinship that we accept the responsibility to criticize, to protect, and to urge the doing of justice.

JOHN C. BENNETT EMIL MAZEY TELFORD TAYLOR
GEORGE B. FORD BAYARD RUSTIN NORMAN THOMAS
Chairman

New York, New York
December 4, 1966

"In the Name of Humanity..." A Statement by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Message sent on Dec 4, 1966 to the Ad-Hoc Commission on Human Rights ~~presided by a prominent American~~ John C. Bennett

THE ATTEMPT TO LIQUIDATE SPIRITUALLY THE Jewish people in Soviet Russia is something that we must not allow. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Injustice to any people is a threat to justice to all people.

I can not stand idly by, even though I live in the United States and even though I happen to be an American Negro, and not be concerned about what happens to my brothers and sisters who happen to be Jews in Soviet Russia. For what happens to them happens to me and to you, and we must be concerned.

I am profoundly shocked by the treatment of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I should like to add my voice to the list of distinguished people of all faiths who have called the injustices perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union to the attention of the world.

The struggle of the Negro people for freedom is inextricably interwoven with the universal struggle of all peoples to be free from discrimination and oppression. The Jewish people must be given their full rights as Soviet citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR itself.

In the name of humanity, I urge that the Soviet Government end all the discriminatory measures against its Jewish community.

I will not remain silent in the face of injustice.

Focus of Protest: The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry

IN MORE THAN A SCORE OF CITIES IN all parts of the United States, the weekend of December 10-11, marking the anniversary of the adoption (in 1948) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, will be the occasion of demonstrations in behalf of equal rights for Jews in the Soviet Union. The anniversary falls in the middle of the week-long observance of the Chanukah festival, commemorating the liberation of Judea from the tyranny of Rome; and the date was chosen for the demonstrations by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry because the two observances—that of the solemn contemporary international pledge to respect human rights, and that of the ancient Jewish victory over oppression—highlights dramatically the systematic denial to the three million Soviet Jews of their rights to religious, ethnic and cultural survival.

The demonstrations are the latest in the series of declarations, protests, meetings, and other activities fostered by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry over a period of two years. Twenty-five national American Jewish organizations coordinate their participation in these activities through the Conference. They are:

American Israel Public Affairs Committee
American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Congress
American Zionist Council
American Trade Union Council for Histadrut
B'nai B'rith-B'nai B'rith Women
Central Conference of American Rabbis
Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations
Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America
The Jewish Agency, American Section
Jewish Labor Committee
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.
Labor Zionist Movement-Poale Zion, Farband, Pioneer Women
Religious Zionists of America-Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi, Mizrachi Women's Organization of America, Women's Organization of Hapoel Hamizrachi
National Community Relations Advisory Council
National Council of Jewish Women
National Council of Young Israel
National Jewish Welfare Board
Rabbinical Assembly
Rabbinical Council of America
Synagogue Council of America
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
United Synagogue of America
Zionist Organization of America

SPACE permits only a partial enumeration of the activities sponsored by the Conference since its formation. Its first major program, which commanded national interest, was an Eternal Light Vigil, a week-long demonstration in the Nation's Capital, during which a symbolic torch was kept aflame and in which upward of ten thousand persons participated. Since then, there have been other vigils and demonstrations in many communities, mass meetings in large cities, special programs in educational institutions. A prayer, the "Matzoh of Oppression," was read in hundreds of thousands of Jewish homes in conjunction with the observance of the Passover; a Declaration of Rights of Soviet Jewry was posted on the walls of hundreds of synagogues and other buildings; ninety members of the U.S. Senate joined in a statement of concern for Soviet Jewry.

UNDER the aegis of the Conference, a manual has been produced to guide Jewish communities in planning and carrying out programs in behalf of Soviet Jewry. A quarterly newsletter about Soviet Jewry has been inaugurated. A traveling exhibit, graphically presenting the plight of Soviet Jewry, is being displayed in many cities, on campuses and elsewhere. Petitions are being drawn up for the signatures of various groups—civil rights leaders, clergymen, academicians, journalists, writers and artists, labor leaders, and others—for transmittal at monthly intervals during the coming year to Soviet leaders.

By these and other means it is planned to continue to keep unrelentingly before the conscience of the world the failure of the Soviet Government to accord to its Jewish citizens the same rights granted other religious, ethnic and nationality groups in Russia.

THAT the program of the American Jewish Conference has had impact is evident. One need only cite some of the changes that have occurred since the inception of the program to make the point: the increasing involvement of the UN and the U.S. Government in the issue; the widespread expressions of concern by large groups of jurists, scholars, clergymen, labor leaders, legislators, and others. Even more significant, perhaps, are unmistakable signs that the Soviet Government has been forced to take cognizance of the spreading condemnation of its policies toward Soviet Jews: its partial lifting of a ban on *matzoth;* its termination of trials for alleged "economic crimes" in which Jews were the highly publicized and cruelly punished accused; its permitting of at least a trickle of emigration; its promises of prayerbooks, Bibles and religious calendars; its limited reopening of a *yeshivah;* its token expansion of Yiddish and Jewish literature.

All of these together are not enough to effect any substantial amelioration of the situation of Russian Jewry. But they courage continuance and intensification of the efforts of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry.

2-4 DAY TOURS

BY AIR CONDITIONED COACHES

SPECIALLY DESIGNED GROUP TOURS FOR JR. AND SR. YOUTH GROUPS, ADULTS & SR. CITIZENS

THE NATION'S CAPITAL; PENNSYLVANIA DUTCH; NIAGARA FALLS; WILLIAMSBURG-JAMESTOWN; CAPE COD & GLOUCESTER; LAKE GEORGE-MONTREAL

ALL TOURS INCLUDE KOSHER MEALS ONLY

SPECIALISTS IN ISRAEL TRAVEL
—GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL TOURS—

For information & brochures, write or call:

CONCOURSE TOURS
Div. of Consolidated Terminal & Travel Bureau
2438 Grand Concourse, Bronx, N.Y. 10458
FOrdham 7-2000

DIRECTORS:
Cy Shavrick Bernard H. Walfish

What is it like to be a Jew in Russia today?

Written by the winner of the 1966 Jewish Heritage Award, this dramatic, deeply personal account of Soviet anti-Semitism is based on the author's own experiences during a trip to the Soviet Union. One of the year's most important and newsworthy books, it rips through the propaganda curtain to expose the truth about religious persecution inside Russia. Must reading!

THE JEWS OF SILENCE

A Personal Report on Soviet Jewry

by ELIE WIESEL

Author of *The Gates of the Forest*

$4.95 from your bookseller, or direct from the publisher.

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
383 Madison Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10017

Get personal. Have all your gifts initialed V.O. this year.

Seagram's V.O. Canadian—Known by the company it keeps

Magnificently gift-wrapped at no extra cost. Canadian whisky—a blend of selected whiskies. 6 years old. 86.8 proof. Seagram Distillers Company, N.Y.C.

Heinz Vegetarian Beans now in two new sizes!

Big... still bigger!

(We've prettied the label a bit. Nice, isn't it?)

The Heinz Vegetarian Beans family has grown. Now there are two new sizes to choose from (plus the two old timers you know so well). That makes four sizes in all. Now you can buy your old favorite, the world's best-selling vegetarian beans, in just the quantity you need.

Heinz Vegetarian Beans, packed in rich, tasty tomato sauce, help to solve some of your meal planning problems. They go so well with so many menus. (Since they are parve as well as Kosher, they may be used with meat or dairy dishes.) Serve Heinz Vegetarian Beans soon. How about tonight? How about including them in the children's lunch tomorrow? The kids love them. Who doesn't? Including the adult who wrote this ad!

57

Ⓤ Strictly Vegetarian. The Ⓤ seal of approval of THE UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA is on the label. On all four sizes. *Of course!*

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay,
Chairman of the Israel Delegation
on Agenda Item 12
on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning, my delegation has steadily urged that this Conference should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. A number of delegations obviously shared our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation.

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as Conference document A/Conf.32/29 of 4 May 1968.). It is headed:
"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (ES-V)".

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In these Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources."

"The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up-to-date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing went to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967)".

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

I would draw attention to the phrases "up-to-date", "once again", "at this time" and so on. It is clearly indicated that the fact-finding mission carried out by Ambassador Gussing in July 1967, a few weeks after the cease-fire, is out-of-date, and that there is no report available depicting the current situation.

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my Government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this Conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter. That refers specifically to the draft resolution in document A/CONF.32/L.19.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguished representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

It seems that no such sympathetic chord was struck in the bosoms of Arab delegations. The item was inscribed; the debate has just been launched with an attack by the representative of the U.A.R.; and an anti-Israel draft resolution has already been tabled. My delegation therefore has no option but to make a full and factual statement concerning the territories held by Israel; without prejudice to our consistent position that this matter is beyond the competence of the Conference. Our statement will cover the following points:

(a) The circumstances under which Israel forces occupied these territores;

(b) The past and present conditions of the civilian population in them;

(c) The situation of Jewish minorities in certain Arab countries in the area of conflict.

I How Israel Occupation came About

It is a matter of history that in 1948 the Arab States rejected the United Nations solution for the Palestine problem and invaded the country, in order to destroy the infant State of Israel by force of arms. During that war, the Arab armies were repulsed, but retained military occupation of certain areas of the country. As a result, Egypt remained in possession of the Gaza Strip and Jordan of the so-called West Bank area, which it later annexed.

Despite United Nations peace-making efforts, the Arab governments refused to accept the State of Israel as a fact, and maintained their policy of belligerency against it - a policy that produced three Israel-Arab wars in nineteen years. The last of these was the Six Day War of June 1967.

Arab spokesmen, and those of certain other countries, have repeatedly made two assertions about the territories held by Israel: firstly, that they were occupied by aggression, and secondly, that the United Nations has called upon Israel to withdraw from them unconditionally. Both these Arab-Soviet assertions were firmly rejected by the United Nations itself, as can be shown from the record. The overwhelming majority of uncommitted and objective member-States refused to give credence to the Arab-Soviet version of the war, the crisis that preceded it and the action that should be taken after it.

That was not surprising. The dramatic events of May and June of 1967 were still too fresh and vivid in the public mind for history to be re-written. In the weeks preceding June 5, the world had watched with impotent dread the massing of Arab armies for what was going to be the final liquidation of the State of Israel. In the Sinai desert, on Israel's exposed southern border, a huge Egyptian invasion force was concentrated from May 14, consisting of over 90,000 men, 900 tanks, 800 heavy guns and 400 war planes. The Egyptian tank force was larger and had far greater striking power than the combined armour of Montgomery and Rommel in the Battle of Alamein.

On May 18, the United Nations and the world were stunned to learn that Egypt had demanded the instant removal of UNEF, the United Nations Peace Force. On 22 May, President Nasser proclaimed a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, the southern sea-route to Israel. On 26 May, President Nasser declared: "I know that by concentrating my troops and by blockading Israel I invite war. I am ready for it. The Arab people want to fight. Our strength is sufficient, and with God's help we will be able to win."

In case there was any doubt about the matter, Cairo Radio explained the same day that the intention was "to wipe Israel off the map". In every mosque there was proclaimed the Jihad, the holy war. The television screens depicted frenzied mobs running through the streets of Cairo and Damascus, screaming with blood-lust. On 30 May, King Hussein flew to Cairo, signed a military pact and placed the Jordan Army under Egyptian command for the coming battle. President Nasser announced: "This deed will astound the world. Today they will know that the Arabs are ready for the fray. The hour of decision has arrived." The next day, Iraq concluded a similar pact with Egypt. Iraqi forces started moving into Jordan, and the Iraqi Defence Minister declared that all the men of the army had been looking forward for 20 years to the moment when they could enter the campaign together with the rest of the Arab armies. In Damascus, there was special rejoicing. For several years, the Syrian government had been pressing hard for a combined Arab attack on Israel, and now the hour seemed to have struck.

The mood of the Arab world before the battle is vividly illustrated by a collection of cartoons from the Arab press in those weeks. They depict Israel as a vicious stereotype straight out of the Nazi "Der Stuermer" - a small, hook-nosed, cringing creature begging for mercy as the gallant Arab soldiers shoot, blast, stab, crush, smash, guillotine, hang, club and throttle it, and drown it in the sea. Some of the same capacity for fantasy and wish-fulfilment, the same semantic intoxication, is now at work in the Arab propaganda picture of life in the Israel administered territories. That picture is a gross perversion of reality. What can be believed is that if the Arab forces had occupied any part of Israel, no Israelis would have been left alive in it.

Israel was in deadly peril, and the whole nation mobilized to fight for its physical survival. The way they fought is known to all. Hostilities broke out on Monday, 5 June and by Saturday, the Arab armies had been smashed one by one. It is not surprising that after the event the opinion of mankind, as reflected at the United Nations, refused to accept the astonishing thesis that the Arab countries were the innocent victims of alleged Israel aggression.

As has been said a number of times at this Conference, there is an intimate relationship between peace and human rights. Wars produce death, displacement and destruction. Let those who launched the Middle East war - let those who go on preaching more war in the future - pause to reflect what human suffering they have caused and may cause again.

I have here sketched the background to the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, that received unanimous support. The resolution says nothing about aggression. It places the question of withdrawal squarely in the context of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including recognized and secure frontiers between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. Till now, no such frontiers have come into existence since the establishment of the State of Israel, which existed only between brittle armistice lines. My country wants a just and lasting peace. We are willing to exchange the existing cease-fire lines for recognized and secure frontiers, as soon as those frontiers are agreed upon as part of a peace settlement. Until such time, we shall to the best of our ability administer the area on our side of the cease-fire lines, and discharge our responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of all the inhabitants of that area.

II Return to Normal Life

At the end of the fighting and the establishment of the cease-fire lines by the Security Council, Israel unexpectedly found itself in possession of territories containing about a million Arabs. Under conditions of collapsed public services, economic life and local security, an administration had to be improvised over-night, and normal living restored as rapidly as possible. This was accomplished with remarkable speed and success. What helped was that the Israel Army is made up mainly of civilian reservists, and was able to draw on the services of administrators, engineers, economists and farm experts

temporarily in uniform. Each of the Israel government ministries concerned attached its representative to the Military Governors; and civilian policy was guided by a committee of Directors-General responsible to a Cabinet Committee.

The most striking feature of the Israel administration is that it is small and unobtrusive, and is able to rely fully upon the cooperation of Arab local authorities in running the affairs of their own towns and villages. The total staff of the Israel administration for all the areas is only about 200, including clerks, secretaries and drivers. The Mayors, Councils and village Mukhtars have remained in office, and the great bulk of teachers, policemen and other persons in public service have continued in the same jobs.

The immediate task was to restore essential services, disrupted and damaged by the war. By September, such public utilities as water, electricity, sanitation and transport were restored, and shortages of certain food-stuffs such as fresh fruit and vegetables, milk and meat had been remedied from Israel stocks. Attention was then concentrated on reviving business activity, finding markets for farm surpluses, providing employment through public works, and generally restoring or even raising the levels of economic activity that had existed before the war. Schools, hospitals and public health services were brought back to normal operation. Due to our diligent efforts, there have been none of the hunger, disease or civilian hardship that is usually found in war-torn areas.

Naturally, these efforts constitute a financial burden for Israel. But it is one which the Israel tax-payer is willing to shoulder, in discharge of our responsibility for the civilian populations in the areas concerned. The budgetary allocation for these civilian services for the nine-month period from June 1967 until the end of the financial year on 31 March 1968 amounted to IL. 150 million, the equivalent of nearly $(US) 50 million.

The population of the four Israel-held territories is as follows: (in round figures):

The West Bank	600,000
The Gaza Strip	360,000
Northern Sinai	33,000
Golan Heights	6,000

The Sinai desert is virtually uninhabited. In the Golan Heights, the Arab population migrated deeper into Syria during the fighting, and only some Druze villages were left. These Druze were never politically or culturally integrated in Syria; they have joined the Druze community inside Israel, and give rise to no difficulties. More needs to be said about the two territories that have a substantial population, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

The Gaza Strip

In an earlier intervention, my delegation put on record some of the facts about the Gaza Strip. As has already been mentioned, this territory was occupied by Egyptian forces in the 1948 fighting and remained a kind of neglected colonial appendage. It was never allowed to become part of Egyptian territory, life and economy, and remained isolated and stagnant. The residents had no political rights, and were ruled by a military boss. The main purpose it served for Egypt was a military one - first as a base for raiding into Israel, and later as a recruiting and training centre for Palestinian brigades of the Egyptian army. When it came under our control in the June war, we found that its economy had rested mainly on large-scale smuggling, the funds spent by UNRWA and other relief agencies, the exploitation of cheap labour by the Egyptian authorities, family remittances from other Arab countries, labour employed by the U.N. Peace Force, (kicked out shortly before the war), and some citrus growing and fishing. The local water resources had been wastefully used and were close to exhaustion and salinity. Industry was non-existent. Cash deposits in the banks had been removed to Egypt before the fighting started.

The Israel authorities have been making a determined effort to improve living conditions in the Strip. By the end of the budgetary year in March, IL. 35 million had been poured by the Israel Government into the territory in loans and subsidies, to stimulate economic activity and create employment. In addition, purchases by visitors from Israel totalled about IL. 10 million. Thousands of workers are being employed in the repair of roads, bridges and damaged buildings; their minimum wages have been doubled and their hours of work fixed at eight hours, for the first time. The citrus groves and fishing fleet have been rehabilitated with the help of Israel grants and loans, and in both cases the output is now well above pre-war levels. The total citrus crop has been sold abroad with the assistance of the Israel Citrus Marketing Board.

The health services have been much improved, with the Palestinian doctors and nurses being given facilities for more advanced training, and being taken on visits to Israel health institutions. Trade schools and work-shops are about to be expanded, and vocational skills taught to adult workers. Gaza residents are now able to travel around freely in Israel and the West Bank, or to visit East Jordan if they wish. The ghetto walls of Gaza have come tumbling down for good.

The West Bank

The West Bank area was occupied in 1948 by Jordanian forces, in defiance of United Nations decisions on Palestine. After that Jordan purported to annex it, but for nineteen years the West Bank remained in effect an occupied territory, without Jordanian absorption of it being recognized by the outside world, even by other Arab States. The inhabitants never became fully reconciled to being ruled from Amman. The history of Jordanian control of the territory before June 1967 was a more disturbed one than its history under Israel control since then. Take for instance, the 18-month period before the war. In January 1966, the Jordanian authorities arrested 200 persons in Jericho; in April, they arrested 2,000 residents of the West Bank; in May, mass demonstrations against the government took place in Jerusalem, Hebron and Ramallah, and were suppressed by force, with the schools closed down and hundreds of persons jailed. In July, disturbances and mass demonstrations broke out again in Nablus, with tear-gas used by the police, twelve persons injured and 250 arrested. In November, December and January, there were a series of disturbances and clashes in the area, with the Jordanian army repeatedly called upon to suppress demonstrations, enforce curfews, and even, on 8 December, break a general business strike by force. On January 13, 1967, Jordanian military units had to surround Nablus and break their way in through barricades erected by the citizens.

By comparison with what went before, the relations between the Israel administration and the local population of the area have been cooperative and free of trouble. This can be confirmed by the hundreds of thousands of Israeli residents, foreign tourists, diplomats, newspaper correspondents and others who travel around the area every day in complete freedom, and comment on the fact that Israel army units or military vehicles are seldom seen.

Economically, the West Bank area was the step-child of Jordan. For internal political reasons, East Jordan was favoured at the expense of West Jordan, which before 1948 had been the more prosperous and developed area of the two. Under Jordan occupation the West Bank had almost half the population, but accounted for only one-third of the output. Economically, the East Bank enjoyed complete priority of investment and development, and all the country's sizable industries were located there. Per capita income in East Jordan was 335 dollars and in the West Bank 216. The West Bank, with almost half the population, was left with one-third of the output, 22% of the industry and 16% of the transport.

Under Israel control, a major effort has been made to revive and develop the economic life on the West Bank. Fifty percent of the population supports itself by farming. In less than a year, agriculture is already beginning to receive a new impetus. A system of production councils have been set up for specific products. Scientific crop-planning has been introduced and new crops such as cotton. Arabic-speaking Israeli instructors have been running special courses and field days for local farmers, more than 8,000 of whom have already received instruction in modern cultivation techniques, irrigation systems, agricultural implements, fertilizers, insecticides and seeding. They are able to visit and learn from the Arab villages in Israel, where the farm output has on the average increased six-fold in two decades.

All handicrafts and small local industries are now working again at full production. In urban and professional occupations, salaries have been increased, family allowances introduced, and office hours and annual leave regulated. There are 7,000 local Arab personnel presently on the salary rolls of the Israel administration on the West Bank including 3,400 teachers and 300 policemen.

Before the war, a great deal of the farm produce of the West Bank was exported to the East Bank, and to Arab countries beyond. This flow of produce was soon resumed with the encouragement of the Israel authorities, and a daily average of more than one hundred loaded trucks crosses the Jordan River eastwards, over Bailey bridges constructed jointly by Israel and Jordan army engineers, alongside the bridges destroyed in the fighting. The value of the produce that has crossed by now is estimated at $15,000,000.

The movement of goods is accompanied by the movement of people. Thousands of persons cross Allenby Bridge to East Jordan on temporary permits issued to them by the Israel authorities, and come back again after one or more weeks. To quote the Foreign Editor of the London "Financial Times": "For the first time ever, the Arabs are travelling in large numbers to and fro between Israeli and Arab territory. ... It is a development arguably more important than any of the other aspects of the Middle East situation ... Some 30,000 people have already taken advantage of this and presumably they can and do report to the East Bank that they are not being slaughtered by the Israelis, that the West Bank is prospering, that the El Fatah terrorists are making no serious impact on the life of the West Bank."

One might add that the West Bank residents, the Gaza residents, and the Israelis are travelling around freely to all parts of the area held by Israel, and this is without doubt having a revolutionary effect on their feelings and attitudes. The Arabs in these territories have different political views about their future, and express them without any inhibitions. But one sentiment they all hold in common - they no longer want war and conflict with Israel, but peace and co-existence with Israel. They have found to their own surprise and resentment that their own leaders and propaganda machines have grossly mislead them. The Israelis with whom they now mingle are neither the murderers and oppressors nor the squirming cowards they have been lead to believe, but decent and creative human beings, with whom these Arabs can live in peace and dignity. That is the shattering development to which the Arab Governments and spokesmen cannot reconcile themselves. That is the source of the compulsion which drives these governments to such a frantic effort to persuade the world that the Israelis are brutal, that they are committing atrocities, that they are trampling on human rights. That compulsion has been much in evidence at this Conference in Teheran.

One form it takes is to promote sneak raids across the cease-fire lines by terrorists and to try and dress up this activity as a resistance movement by the local population against Israel occupiers. That picture is false. No such resistance movement exists in Israel-held territories. Nor was this kind of border warfare born out of the Six Day War. We have been accustomed to periods of organized terrorism, whenever the Arab countries around us shrank from a direct

military confrontation with Israel. One such period was from 1953 to 1956, when the murderous fedayeen raids deep into Israel territory were organized by the Egyptian authorities from the Gaza Strip. That form of armed attack led directly to the Sinai Campaign of October 1956, and the occupation of the Gaza Strip by Israel at that time. For a decade after that the Israel-Egyptian border remained quiet, for the simple reason that raiding by armed terrorists and saboteurs was regarded as too dangerous while Egypt was building up its strength for a future military showdown with Israel. But a few years later, in the sixties, the same type of operation was launched by the Syrian regime, under the name of "people's war". As a rule, the terrorist squads, trained and equipped by Syria were sent into Israel across the Jordan and Lebanese borders. For several years these incursions across the border, and Israel's occasional reaction to them, was the central theme of Security Council debates on the tension and danger to peace in the Middle East. I was myself at that time my country's representative to the United Nations, and on a number of occasions presented details of these organized guerilla activities to the Security Council.

Every definition of aggression that has ever been suggested at the United Nations includes this type of activity. I would draw particular attention to a Draft Convention on the definition of aggression submitted some years ago by the USSR in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

> "The Aggressor in an international conflict shall be considered to be that state which is the first to commit any of the following actions...
>
> 1 e. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state.
>
> f. Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another state, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded state to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection.
>
> 2. Attacks such as those referred to in paragraph 1 may not be justified by any arguments of a political, strategic or economic nature, or by the affirmation that the state attacked lacks the distinguishing marks of statehood, (USSR Draft Resolution, A/06/L.208)."

The relevance of that definition to the Middle East is plain. These El Fatah raids are a form of armed aggression by Arab States against Israel.

They are open violations of the cease-fire. Israel must take all necessary measures to repel and restrict them. That is also our duty under the United Nations resolutions which make Israel responsible for the safety and security of Israel-held territories.

It is also worth mentioing that the border areas where this terrorist activity is most marked are not the areas occupied by Israel in June 1967, but those districts, such as the Beisan Valley and the Negev in the south, that have always been part of the State of Israel.

One final comment on this point. The present El Fatah terrorists, like their predecessors, in the years before June 1967, or the fedayun from the Gaza Strip, may be lauded as Arab heroes. We regard them as cowardly murderers, who sneak in under cover of darkness to put dynamite under the homes of sleeping farmers' families, place mines on roads where bus-loads of children can be blown up, or throw hand-grenades into crowded market-places and run away. Our European friends have their own recollections of the heroism of the resistance. Let me quote a resolution adopted by the International Union of Resistance Movements and Deportation Victims, at its conference in Brussels from 31 March to 2 April, of this year.

It declares that nobody should be permitted to compare the spirit of the resistance movements with terrorist acts and odious crimes which aim at blindly creating insecurity and fear, and provoking violence, at a time when every opportunity is being publicly offered for a genuine discussion of all matters in dispute. The resolution expresses a sense of outrage and insult at comparing Nazism with the defence by the citizens of Israel of their right to exist.

Religion

One of the most important gains of the Six Day War is in the field of religious rights and liberties. Jordanian behaviour towards Jewish rights was barbarous. During the fighting of 1948, the inhabitants of the ancient Jewish quarter of the Old City, and of Jewish villages like the Etzion Bloc near Hebron, were slaughtered or carried off as captives. The Jewish quarter itself was destroyed, and not a single one of its 35 synagogues left intact.

The cemetary on the Mount of Olives, where Jews have been buried since times immemorial has been completely desecrated and tens of thousands of tombstones smashed or carted off to be used for buildings, army camps and even latrines. For 19 years of Jordanian occupation, no single Jew was allowed access to the most sacred holy place of our religion, the Western Wall in the Old City, although this was a right expressly guaranteed by the 1949 Armistice Agreement. A limited number of Christian Arabs in Israel were allowed to cross to Bethlehem twice a year, but no Arab Moslems from Israel were allowed to go on pilgrimage to Mecca. The Egyptian authorities in the Gaza Strip also prevented its Moslems from making the pilgrimage.

All this injustice has been remedied since the June war. Within weeks of the cease-fire, on 27 June 1967, the Knesset (the Israel Parliament) adopted a law for the protection of all holy and sacred places, and guaranteeing complete freedom of access for the members of every religion, to the places sacred to them. For the first time in twenty years there is complete freedom of worship, of access and of pilgrimage for all faiths in the Holy Land.

Refugees

Immediately after the fighting, the Israel Government proposed to UNRWA to continue its work in the areas concerned, and signed an agreement of cooperation with the Agency. As the Commissioner-General, Dr. Michelmore, reported to the last session of the General Assembly, this cooperation has been satisfactory. UNRWA has been given every facility and assistance for continuing its humanitarian task in Israel-held areas.

One of the matters which the Commissioner-General has stressed in his reports has been the substantial movement of persons from the West Bank area to East Jordan and beyond. This was initially a flight during the fighting, which on the Jordan front lasted only 72 hours. Since then, there has been an orderly and voluntary movement for a variety of reasons - partly family ties; partly economic, because of sources of income in Jordan or remittances from elsewhere in the Arab world; partly psychological, because of uncertainty about the future. The migration trend for a decade before the war was from West to East. Of recent months, the movement from the West Bank has become negligible, though there is a small-scale movement from the Gaza Strip. The policy of the Israel Government has been that it has no right to keep anyone in Israel-held territory against

his will. None of these people have been driven out, as is alleged from Arab sources.

As the Conference is aware, the United Nations resolutions requested the Israel Government to facilitate the return of those who wished to come back. The Israel Government has been willing to do so, subject to the overall security situation, which does not permit of an uncontrolled mass influx. Last year, my Government proposed a repatriation scheme, with the cooperation of the International Red Cross. Under this scheme, 21,000 persons were issued with permits to return, but only 14,000 of them actually appeared. The Israel Government then proposed finding and bringing back the other 7,000, but this was not carried out because of Jordanian non-cooperation - in fact Jordanian representatives failed even to show up at a meeting arranged by the Red Cross to discuss the matter. No doubt much larger numbers might have been authorized at that time, if the Jordan Government had not tried to exploit a humanitarian gesture for political and security purposes, by inciting the returnees to obstruct and undermine the Israel administration. Subsequently, the Israel Government again took the initiative in launching another repatriation project based on the re-union of families and hardship cases. This project too was carried out at first with the cooperation of the International Red Cross, until two Red Cross representatives were wounded by Jordanian fire at the Allenby Bridge. The Israel Government is proceeding on its own. Applications for the return of their relatives are made by West Bank families through their own local authorities. The approved names are then broadcast, and every Monday and Thursday morning groups of these returnees appear at the bridge and are permitted to cross. Indeed, the Allenby Bridge has become one of the busiest and most curious transit points in the region.

My Government and people aresensitive to the humanitarian problems of refugees, and will try to ease them to the extent that the situation allows. Unfortunately the problem of displacement cannot entirely be divorced from the situation which gave rise to it. There is no doubt that in any movement towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the highest priority should be given to these humanitarian questions.

Israel's treatment of these territories is described in an interesting article called "The Israelis as Occupiers" that appeared in the London Daily Telegraph a few days ago, on April 30, from a Special Correspondent. I shall

quote a few extracts from it:

"Israel's occupation of conquered territories has, in general, been the most humane and generous in modern history, even more so than the American occupation of Japan after World War II. And this is proving to be very good practical politics. ...

Failure of the Al Fatah guerrilla movement, based in Jordan, to achieve any major results in Israeli-occupied territory, is also significant. The fantastically absurd claims of Fatah "victories" broadcast from Arab capitals are a sorry joke among the Arabs under Israel. To date, the men who swagger around Amman terrorising the merchants for cash hand-outs have achieved no major military advantage. They have failed to establish guerrilla bases on the West Bank.

Economic conditions for Arabs in the occupied territories are improving. Many of them, even the professional refugees, are better off than they have every been before. ...

Arab wages are rising to a level set by Israeli trade unions. Administration of Arab affairs is still handled by the same mayors and officials who were there before the June war. Most of them admit in private conversation that they have more freedom of movement and expression today than they had under King Hussein's rule. ...

On its record so far Israel can have a clear conscience before the United Nations or any other international bar on its handling of the occupied Arab territories."

There are some delegates here who have recently been to Israel and can confirm the validity of the "Daily Telegraph" account. All other delegates at this Conference, including the Arab delegates, are welcome to come and see for themselves the situation on the ground. I would not suggest that there are no security problems in combating terrorism, or that all the Arab population is contented, or even that it wishes to remain indefinitely under Israel control. But, having regard to all the circumstances, the degree of normalcy, and peaceful cooperation is astonishing, and a genuine tribute to the humane and positive character of the Israel administration. This is for us

not only a matter of principle but also one of enlightened self-interest. Oppression and ill-treatment would be self-defeating, for it would only increase Arab hostility against Israel. We wish to demonstrate that despite the history of conflict, Jew and Arab can live together in amity in the region we share. That lesson is being learnt between the two-and-a-half million Jews and one-and-a-half million Arabs in the Israel administered area, and that is the most hopeful augury for a better future. Whatever may be our faults and mistakes, it is false and unwarranted to talk of Israel's violation of or disregard for human rights, as the draft resolution in document L.19 tries to do.

III. The Jewish Minorities in the Area

It has been pointed out that civilians in the whole area of conflict, including the Arab States, come within the purview of the United Nations resolutions and the Secretary-General's task of reporting.

My delegation accuses the Governments of Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Iraq of flagrantly violating human rights, in relation to their Jewish civilians. In 1948, Jordanian forces occupied the West Bank area and the Old City of Jerusalem; the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and every Jewish village in the occupied area were destroyed; and their inhabitants were butchered or carried off. Not one single Jew resided in the Kingdom of Jordan from 1948 onwards.

In Egypt, Syria and Iraq, the ancient and peaceful Jewish communities, going back for centuries, became the scapegoat for Arab defeat and frustration. From 1948, they were discriminated against, persecuted, threatened, in most cases deprived of their property and livelihood, and forced to leave their native lands. By June 1967, these communities had shrunken in Egypt from 80,000 to 2,500; in Iraq from 15,000 to 3,000.

The State of Israel has since 1948 absorbed half a million Jewish refugees from the Arab world. This is about the same number as the Arab refugees who left territory that became part of Israel -- so there has in effect been a rough exchange of minorities.

In the wake of the Six Day War of 1967, the remnants of the Jewish communities in Egypt, Syria and Iraq suffered fresh ill-treatment and suffering. My delegation has already placed before the Conference, in previous interventions, the facts about Cairo and Damascus. The Syrian representative has told us that Mr. Gussing was allowed to talk to a few Jews, who did not complain to him. That is hardly surprising, given the kind of regime that exists in Syria. Amongst other measures, Jews are forbidden to leave the country, and have to bear identity cards with the word "Jew" inscribed on them in red.

After the June 1967 War, Jews in Iraq were once more boycotted and dismissed from jobs; numbers of them were arrested; their property was sequestrated; Jewish students expelled from universities and schools.

I have here the English and Arabic texts of Iraqui Law No. 10 of 1968, published in the Iraqui Government Gazette No. 1542 dated 3 March 19 8. Its title is "Amending Law Supplementary to Law for the Supervision and Management of the Properties of the Denationalised Jews, No. 12 of 1951."

The law instructs the authorities concerned to abstain from carrying out or registering any transaction relating to immovable property belonging to a Jew, unless the Minister of the Interior expressly allows it. Even then, the proceeds must be placed in a blocked bank account. This law renders more stringent Amending Law Number 64 of 1967, adopted just after the Six Day War. These laws simply continue the process of seizing Jewish property, begun after the 1948 war.

Mr. President,

It is these Arab Governments that have come here to accuse Israel of a disregard for human rights. The adage about "people in glass houses" applies forcefully.

In conclusion, my delegation would make some initial observations on Draft Resolution L. 19, submitted by the delegations of Mali and Spain. It is not surprising that a number of the delegations that

originally considered co-sponsoring it, have refused to do so. It is a hopelessly slanted and unworthy proposal.

For instance, in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, the United Nations resolutions are carefully paraphrased so as to avoid mentioning that they apply to all the States in the area of conflict; on the contrary, it is implied that those resolutions were addressed only to the Government of Israel.

In the next paragraph, the question of the status of Jerusalem is slipped in by the back-door, though it has nothing to do with this Conference and has not even been discussed.

In the last part of the preamble, a reference to a telegram from the Human Rights Commission is edited so as to omit the fact that the Commission was relying not on verified facts but on newspaper reports. It was an unfortunate lapse on the part of the Commission, when it let itself be pushed into telling the government of a sovereign member-State to "desist forthwith" from security measures the Commission had read about in the press.

It is this kind of hasty and ill-considered action that the Conference is now being asked to take by the draft resolution before us.

The first two operative paragraphs contain a sweeping generalisation that human rights are being violated in Arab territories, and that the Government of Israel must be told of the grave consequences resulting from alleged disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights.

What is the evidence for this judgment the Conference is asked to pronounce? It is not supported by the documents cited in the preamble, nor by any independent inquiry. On the contrary, the Secretary-General, when faced with "allegations and concerns" about the treatment of civilians in the area, made clear that he lacked the necessary facts for reporting, and would send someone to the area for this purpose. My delegation rejects and repudiates these paragraphs. We have been at some pains to give the Conference an account of Israel's

administration of the territories. It is a creditable record. We find it hard to imagine that any fair-minded and unprejudiced delegation would fail to oppose this draft resolution.

The second draft resolution, L. , submitted by the delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay, is of a completely different nature. It deals with broad principles, and as regards the Middle East, confines itself to noting the action being taken by the Secretary-General, without attempting to draw any premature and unwarranted conclusions.

The contrast between the two draft resolutions, in substance and spirit, is a striking one, and it strongly reveals the wholly partisan character of draft resolution L. 19.

Thank you, Madame President.

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

6 May 1968.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay,
Chairman of the Israel Delegation
on Agenda Item 12
on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning, my delegation has steadily urged that this Conference should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. A number of delegations obviously shared our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation.

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as Conference document A/Conf.32/29 of 4 May 1968.). It is headed:
"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (ES-V)".

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In these Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources."

"The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up-to-date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing went to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967)".

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

I would draw attention to the phrases "up-to-date", "once again", "at this time" and so on. It is clearly indicated that the fact-finding mission carried out by Ambassador Gussing in July 1967, a few weeks after the cease-fire, is out-of-date, and that there is no report available depicting the current situation.

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my Government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this Conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter. That refers specifically to the draft resolution in document A/CONF.32/L.19.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguished representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

It seems that no such sympathetic chord was struck in the bosoms of Arab delegations. The item was inscribed; the debate has just been launched with an attack by the representative of the U.A.R.; and an anti-Israel draft resolution has already been tabled. My delegation therefore has no option but to make a full and factual statement concerning the territories held by Israel; without prejudice to our consistent position that this matter is beyond the competence of the Conference. Our statement will cover the following points:

(a) The circumstances under which Israel forces occupied these territores;

(b) The past and present conditions of the civilian population in them;

(c) The situation of Jewish minorities in certain Arab countries in the area of conflict.

I How Israel Occupation came About

It is a matter of history that in 1948 the Arab States rejected the United Nations solution for the Palestine problem and invaded the country, in order to destroy the infant State of Israel by force of arms. During that war, the Arab armies were repulsed, but retained military occupation of certain areas of the country. As a result, Egypt remained in possession of the Gaza Strip and Jordan of the so-called West Bank area, which it later annexed.

Despite United Nations peace-making efforts, the Arab governments refused to accept the State of Israel as a fact, and maintained their policy of belligerency against it - a policy that produced three Israel-Arab wars in nineteen years. The last of these was the Six Day War of June 1967.

Arab spokesmen, and those of certain other countries, have repeatedly made two assertions about the territories held by Israel: firstly, that they were occupied by aggression, and secondly, that the United Nations has called upon Israel to withdraw from them unconditionally. Both these Arab-Soviet assertions were firmly rejected by the United Nations itself, as can be shown from the record. The overwhelming majority of uncommitted and objective member-States refused to give credence to the Arab-Soviet version of the war, the crisis that preceded it and the action that should be taken after it.

That was not surprising. The dramatic events of May and June of 1967 were still too fresh and vivid in the public mind for history to be re-written. In the weeks preceding June 5, the world had watched with impotent dread the massing of Arab armies for what was going to be the final liquidation of the State of Israel. In the Sinai desert, on Israel's exposed southern border, a huge Egyptian invasion force was concentrated from May 14, consisting of over 90,000 men, 900 tanks, 800 heavy guns and 400 war planes. The Egyptian tank force was larger and had far greater striking power than the combined armour of Montgomery and Rommel in the Battle of Alamein.

On May 18, the United Nations and the world were stunned to learn that Egypt had demanded the instant removal of UNEF, the United Nations Peace Force. On 22 May, President Nasser proclaimed a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, the southern sea-route to Israel. On 26 May, President Nasser declared: "I know that by concentrating my troops and by blockading Israel I invite war. I am ready for it. The Arab people want to fight. Our strength is sufficient, and with God's help we will be able to win."

In case there was any doubt about the matter, Cairo Radio explained the same day that the intention was "to wipe Israel off the map". In every mosque there was proclaimed the Jihad, the holy war. The television screens depicted frenzied mobs running through the streets of Cairo and Damascus, screaming with blood-lust. On 30 May, King Hussein flew to Cairo, signed a military pact and placed the Jordan Army under Egyptian command for the coming battle. President Nasser announced: "This deed will astound the world. Today they will know that the Arabs are ready for the fray. The hour of decision has arrived." The next day, Iraq concluded a similar pact with Egypt. Iraqi forces started moving into Jordan, and the Iraqi Defence Minister declared that all the men of the army had been looking forward for 20 years to the moment when they could enter the campaign together with the rest of the Arab armies. In Damascus, there was special rejoicing. For several years, the Syrian government had been pressing hard for a combined Arab attack on Israel, and now the hour seemed to have struck.

The mood of the Arab world before the battle is vividly illustrated by a collection of cartoons from the Arab press in those weeks. They depict Israel as a vicious stereotype straight out of the Nazi "Der Stuermer" - a small, hook-nosed, cringing creature begging for mercy as the gallant Arab soldiers shoot, blast, stab, crush, smash, guillotine, hang, club and throttle it, and drown it in the sea. Some of the same capacity for fantasy and wish-fulfilment, the same semantic intoxication, is now at work in the Arab propaganda picture of life in the Israel administered territories. That picture is a gross perversion of reality. What can be believed is that if the Arab forces had occupied any part of Israel, no Israelis would have been left alive in it.

Israel was in deadly peril, and the whole nation mobilized to fight for its physical survival. The way they fought is known to all. Hostilities broke out on Monday, 5 June and by Saturday, the Arab armies had been smashed one by one. It is not surprising that after the event the opinion of mankind, as reflected at the United Nations, refused to accept the astonishing thesis that the Arab countries were the innocent victims of alleged Israel aggression.

As has been said a number of times at this Conference, there is an intimate relationship between peace and human rights. Wars produce death, displacement and destruction. Let those who launched the Middle East war - let those who go on preaching more war in the future - pause to reflect what human suffering they have caused and may cause again.

I have here sketched the background to the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, that received unanimous support. The resolution says nothing about aggression. It places the question of withdrawal squarely in the context of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including recognized and secure frontiers between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. Till now, no such frontiers have come into existence since the establishment of the State of Israel, which existed only between brittle armistice lines. My country wants a just and lasting peace. We are willing to exchange the existing cease-fire lines for recognized and secure frontiers, as soon as those frontiers are agreed upon as part of a peace settlement. Until such time, we shall to the best of our ability administer the area on our side of the cease-fire lines, and discharge our responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of all the inhabitants of that area.

II Return to Normal Life

At the end of the fighting and the establishment of the cease-fire lines by the Security Council, Israel unexpectedly found itself in possession of territories containing about a million Arabs. Under conditions of collapsed public services, economic life and local security, an administration had to be improvised over-night, and normal living restored as rapidly as possible. This was accomplished with remarkable speed and success. What helped was that the Israel Army is made up mainly of civilian reservists, and was able to draw on the services of administrators, engineers, economists and farm experts

temporarily in uniform. Each of the Israel government ministries concerned attached its representative to the Military Governors; and civilian policy was guided by a committee of Directors-General responsible to a Cabinet Committee.

The most striking feature of the Israel administration is that it is small and unobtrusive, and is able to rely fully upon the cooperation of Arab local authorities in running the affairs of their own towns and villages. The total staff of the Israel administration for all the areas is only about 200, including clerks, secretaries and drivers. The Mayors, Councils and village Mukhtars have remained in office, and the great bulk of teachers, policemen and other persons in public service have continued in the same jobs.

The immediate task was to restore essential services, disrupted and damaged by the war. By September, such public utilities as water, electricity, sanitation and transport were restored, and shortages of certain food-stuffs such as fresh fruit and vegetables, milk and meat had been remedied from Israel stocks. Attention was then concentrated on reviving business activity, finding markets for farm surpluses, providing employment through public works, and generally restoring or even raising the levels of economic activity that had existed before the war. Schools, hospitals and public health services were brought back to normal operation. Due to our diligent efforts, there have been none of the hunger, disease or civilian hardship that is usually found in war-torn areas.

Naturally, these efforts constitute a financial burden for Israel. But it is one which the Israel tax-payer is willing to shoulder, in discharge of our responsibility for the civilian populations in the areas concerned. The budgetary allocation for these civilian services for the nine-month period from June 1967 until the end of the financial year on 31 March 1968 amounted to IL. 150 million, the equivalent of nearly $(US) 50 million.

The population of the four Israel-held territories is as follows: (in round figures):

The West Bank	600,000
The Gaza Strip	360,000
Northern Sinai	33,000
Golan Heights	6,000

The Sinai desert is virtually uninhabited. In the Golan Heights, the Arab population migrated deeper into Syria during the fighting, and only some Druze villages were left. These Druze were never politically or culturally integrated in Syria; they have joined the Druze community inside Israel, and give rise to no difficulties. More needs to be said about the two territories that have a substantial population, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

The Gaza Strip

In an earlier intervention, my delegation put on record some of the facts about the Gaza Strip. As has already been mentioned, this territory was occupied by Egyptian forces in the 1948 fighting and remained a kind of neglected colonial appendage. It was never allowed to become part of Egyptian territory, life and economy, and remained isolated and stagnant. The residents had no political rights, and were ruled by a military boss. The main purpose it served for Egypt was a military one - first as a base for raiding into Israel, and later as a recruiting and training centre for Palestinian brigades of the Egyptian army. When it came under our control in the June war, we found that its economy had rested mainly on large-scale smuggling, the funds spent by UNRWA and other relief agencies, the exploitation of cheap labour by the Egyptian authorities, family remittances from other Arab countries, labour employed by the U.N. Peace Force, (kicked out shortly before the war), and some citrus growing and fishing. The local water resources had been wastefully used and were close to exhaustion and salinity. Industry was non-existent. Cash deposits in the banks had been removed to Egypt before the fighting started.

The Israel authorities have been making a determined effort to improve living conditions in the Strip. By the end of the budgetary year in March, IL. 35 million had been poured by the Israel Government into the territory in loans and subsidies, to stimulate economic activity and create employment. In addition, purchases by visitors from Israel totalled about IL. 10 million. Thousands of workers are being employed in the repair of roads, bridges and damaged buildings; their minimum wages have been doubled and their hours of work fixed at eight hours, for the first time. The citrus groves and fishing fleet have been rehabilitated with the help of Israel grants and loans, and in both cases the output is now well above pre-war levels. The total citrus crop has been sold abroad with the assistance of the Israel Citrus Marketing Board.

The health services have been much improved, with the Palestinian doctors and nurses being given facilities for more advanced training, and being taken on visits to Israel health institutions. Trade schools and work-shops are about to be expanded, and vocational skills taught to adult workers. Gaza residents are now able to travel around freely in Israel and the West Bank, or to visit East Jordan if they wish. The ghetto walls of Gaza have come tumbling down for good.

The West Bank

The West Bank area was occupied in 1948 by Jordanian forces, in defiance of United Nations decisions on Palestine. After that Jordan purported to annex it, but for nineteen years the West Bank remained in effect an occupied territory, without Jordanian absorption of it being recognized by the outside world, even by other Arab States. The inhabitants never became fully reconciled to being ruled from Amman. The history of Jordanian control of the territory before June 1967 was a more disturbed one than its history under Israel control since then. Take for instance, the 18-month period before the war. In January 1966, the Jordanian authorities arrested 200 persons in Jericho; in April, they arrested 2,000 residents of the West Bank; in May, mass demonstrations against the government took place in Jerusalem, Hebron and Ramallah, and were suppressed by force, with the schools closed down and hundreds of persons jailed. In July, disturbances and mass demonstrations broke out again in Nablus, with tear-gas used by the police, twelve persons injured and 250 arrested. In November, December and January, there were a series of disturbances and clashes in the area, with the Jordanian army repeatedly called upon to suppress demonstrations, enforce curfews, and even, on 8 December, break a general business strike by force. On January 13, 1967, Jordanian military units had to surround Nablus and break their way in through barricades erected by the citizens.

By comparison with what went before, the relations between the Israel administration and the local population of the area have been cooperative and free of trouble. This can be confirmed by the hundreds of thousands of Israeli residents, foreign tourists, diplomats, newspaper correspondents and others who travel around the area every day in complete freedom, and comment on the fact that Israel army units or military vehicles are seldom seen.

Economically, the West Bank area was the step-child of Jordan. For internal political reasons, East Jordan was favoured at the expense of West Jordan, which before 1948 had been the more prosperous and developed area of the two. Under Jordan occupation the West Bank had almost half the population, but accounted for only one-third of the output. Economically, the East Bank enjoyed complete priority of investment and development, and all the country's sizable industries were located there. Per capita income in East Jordan was 335 dollars and in the West Bank 216. The West Bank, with almost half the population, was left with one-third of the output, 22% of the industry and 16% of the transport.

Under Israel control, a major effort has been made to revive and develop the economic life on the West Bank. Fifty percent of the population supports itself by farming. In less than a year, agriculture is already beginning to receive a new impetus. A system of production councils have been set up for specific products. Scientific crop-planning has been introduced and new crops such as cotton. Arabic-speaking Israeli instructors have been running special courses and field days for local farmers, more than 8,000 of whom have already received instruction in modern cultivation techniques, irrigation systems, agricultural implements, fertilizers, insecticides and seeding. They are able to visit and learn from the Arab villages in Israel, where the farm output has on the average increased six-fold in two decades.

All handicrafts and small local industries are now working again at full production. In urban and professional occupations, salaries have been increased, family allowances introduced, and office hours and annual leave regulated. There are 7,000 local Arab personnel presently on the salary rolls of the Israel administration on the West Bank including 3,400 teachers and 300 policemen.

Before the war, a great deal of the farm produce of the West Bank was exported to the East Bank, and to Arab countries beyond. This flow of produce was soon resumed with the encouragement of the Israel authorities, and a daily average of more than one hundred loaded trucks crosses the Jordan River eastwards, over Bailey bridges constructed jointly by Israel and Jordan army engineers, alongside the bridges destroyed in the fighting. The value of the produce that has crossed by now is estimated at $15,000,000.

The movement of goods is accompanied by the movement of people. Thousands of persons cross Allenby Bridge to East Jordan on temporary permits issued to them by the Israel authorities, and come back again after one or more weeks. To quote the Foreign Editor of the London "Financial Times": "For the first time ever, the Arabs are travelling in large numbers to and fro between Israeli and Arab territory. ... It is a development arguably more important than any of the other aspects of the Middle East situation ... Some 30,000 people have already taken advantage of this and presumably they can and do report to the East Bank that they are not being slaughtered by the Israelis, that the West Bank is prospering, that the El Fatah terrorists are making no serious impact on the life of the West Bank."

One might add that the West Bank residents, the Gaza residents, and the Israelis are travelling around freely to all parts of the area held by Israel, and this is without doubt having a revolutionary effect on their feelings and attitudes. The Arabs in these territories have different political views about their future, and express them without any inhibitions. But one sentiment they all hold in common - they no longer want war and conflict with Israel, but peace and co-existence with Israel. They have found to their own surprise and resentment that their own leaders and propaganda machines have grossly mislead them. The Israelis with whom they now mingle are neither the murderers and oppressors nor the squirming cowards they have been lead to believe, but decent and creative human beings, with whom these Arabs can live in peace and dignity. That is the shattering development to which the Arab Governments and spokesmen cannot reconcile themselves. That is the source of the compulsion which drives these governments to such a frantic effort to persuade the world that the Israelis are brutal, that they are committing atrocities, that they are trampling on human rights. That compulsion has been much in evidence at this Conference in Teheran.

One form it takes is to promote sneak raids across the cease-fire lines by terrorists and to try and dress up this activity as a resistance movement by the local population against Israel occupiers. That picture is false. No such resistance movement exists in Israel-held territories. Nor was this kind of border warfare born out of the Six Day War. We have been accustomed to periods of organized terrorism, whenever the Arab countries around us shrank from a direct

military confrontation with Israel. One such period was from 1953 to 1956, when the murderous fedayeen raids deep into Israel territory were organized by the Egyptian authorities from the Gaza Strip. That form of armed attack led directly to the Sinai Campaign of October 1956, and the occupation of the Gaza Strip by Israel at that time. For a decade after that the Israel-Egyptian border remained quiet, for the simple reason that raiding by armed terrorists and saboteurs was regarded as too dangerous while Egypt was building up its strength for a future military showdown with Israel. But a few years later, in the sixties, the same type of operation was launched by the Syrian regime, under the name of "people's war". As a rule, the terrorist squads, trained and equipped by Syria were sent into Israel across the Jordan and Lebanese borders. For several years these incursions across the border, and Israel's occasional reaction to them, was the central theme of Security Council debates on the tension and danger to peace in the Middle East. I was myself at that time my country's representative to the United Nations, and on a number of occasions presented details of these organized guerilla activities to the Security Council.

Every definition of aggression that has ever been suggested at the United Nations includes this type of activity. I would draw particular attention to a Draft Convention on the definition of aggression submitted some years ago by the USSR in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

> "The Aggressor in an international conflict shall be considered to be that state which is the first to commit any of the following actions...
>
> e. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state.
>
> f. Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another state, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded state to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection.
>
> 2. Attacks such as those referred to in paragraph 1 may not be justified by any arguments of a political, strategic or economic nature, or by the affirmation that the state attacked lacks the distinguishing marks of statehood, (USSR Draft Resolution, A/06/L.208)."

The relevance of that definition to the Middle East is plain. These El Fatah raids are a form of armed aggression by Arab States against Israel.

They are open violations of the cease-fire. Israel must take all necessary measures to repel and restrict them. That is also our duty under the United Nations resolutions which make Israel responsible for the safety and security of Israel-held territories.

It is also worth mentioing that the border areas where this terrorist activity is most marked are not the areas occupied by Israel in June 1967, but those districts, such as the Beisan Valley and the Negev in the south, that have always been part of the State of Israel.

One final comment on this point. The present El Fatah terrorists, like their predecessors, in the years before June 1967, or the fedayun from the Gaza Strip, may be lauded as Arab heroes. We regard them as cowardly murderers, who sneak in under cover of darkness to put dynamite under the homes of sleeping farmers' families, place mines on roads where bus-loads of children can be blown up, or throw hand-grenades into crowded market-places and run away. Our European friends have their own recollections of the heroism of the resistance. Let me quote a resolution adopted by the International Union of Resistance Movements and Deportation Victims, at its conference in Brussels from 31 March to 2 April, of this year.

It declares that nobody should be permitted to compare the spirit of the resistance movements with terrorist acts and odious crimes which aim at blindly creating insecurity and fear, and provoking violence, at a time when every opportunity is being publicly offered for a genuine discussion of all matters in dispute. The resolution expresses a sense of outrage and insult at comparing Nazism with the defence by the citizens of Israel of their right to exist.

Religion

One of the most important gains of the Six Day War is in the field of religious rights and liberties. Jordanian behaviour towards Jewish rights was barbarous. During the fighting of 1948, the inhabitants of the ancient Jewish quarter of the Old City, and of Jewish villages like the Etzion Bloc near Hebron, were slaughtered or carried off as captives. The Jewish quarter itself was destroyed, and not a single one of its 35 synagogues left intact.

The cemetary on the Mount of Olives, where Jews have been buried since times immemorial has been completely desecrated and tens of thousands of tombstones smashed or carted off to be used for buildings, army camps and even latrines. For 19 years of Jordanian occupation, no single Jew was allowed access to the most sacred holy place of our religion, the Western Wall in the Old City, although this was a right expressly guaranteed by the 1949 Armistice Agreement. A limited number of Christian Arabs in Israel were allowed to cross to Bethlehem twice a year, but no Arab Moslems from Israel were allowed to go on pilgrimage to Mecca. The Egyptian authorities in the Gaza Strip also prevented its Moslems from making the pilgrimage.

All this injustice has been remedied since the June war. Within weeks of the cease-fire, on 27 June 1967, the Knesset (the Israel Parliament) adopted a law for the protection of all holy and sacred places, and guaranteeing complete freedom of access for the members of every religion, to the places sacred to them. For the first time in twenty years there is complete freedom of worship, of access and of pilgrimage for all faiths in the Holy Land.

Refugees

Immediately after the fighting, the Israel Government proposed to UNRWA to continue its work in the areas concerned, and signed an agreement of cooperation with the Agency. As the Commissioner-General, Dr. Michelmore, reported to the last session of the General Assembly, this cooperation has been satisfactory. UNRWA has been given every facility and assistance for continuing its humanitarian task in Israel-held areas.

One of the matters which the Commissioner-General has stressed in his reports has been the substantial movement of persons from the West Bank area to East Jordan and beyond. This was initially a flight during the fighting, which on the Jordan front lasted only 72 hours. Since then, there has been an orderly and voluntary movement for a variety of reasons - partly family ties; partly economic, because of sources of income in Jordan or remittances from elsewhere in the Arab world; partly psychological, because of uncertainty about the future. The migration trend for a decade before the war was from West to East. Of recent months, the movement from the West Bank has become negligible, though there is a small-scale movement from the Gaza Strip. The policy of the Israel Government has been that it has no right to keep anyone in Israel-held territory against

his will. None of these people have been driven out, as is alleged from Arab sources.

As the Conference is aware, the United Nations resolutions requested the Israel Government to facilitate the return of those who wished to come back. The Israel Government has been willing to do so, subject to the overall security situation, which does not permit of an uncontrolled mass influx. Last year, my Government proposed a repatriation scheme, with the cooperation of the International Red Cross. Under this scheme, 21,000 persons were issued with permits to return, but only 14,000 of them actually appeared. The Israel Government then proposed finding and bringing back the other 7,000, but this was not carried out because of Jordanian non-cooperation - in fact Jordanian representatives failed even to show up at a meeting arranged by the Red Cross to discuss the matter. No doubt much larger numbers might have been authorized at that time, if the Jordan Government had not tried to exploit a humanitarian gesture for political and security purposes, by inciting the returnees to obstruct and undermine the Israel administration. Subsequently, the Israel Government again took the initiative in launching another repatriation project based on the re-union of families and hardship cases. This project too was carried out at first with the cooperation of the International Red Cross, until two Red Cross representatives were wounded by Jordanian fire at the Allenby Bridge. The Israel Government is proceeding on its own. Applications for the return of their relatives are made by West Bank families through their own local authorities. The approved names are then broadcast, and every Monday and Thursday morning groups of these returnees appear at the bridge and are permitted to cross. Indeed, the Allenby Bridge has become one of the busiest and most curious transit points in the region.

My Government and people aresensitive to the humanitarian problems of refugees, and will try to ease them to the extent that the situation allows. Unfortunately the problem of displacement cannot entirely be divorced from the situation which gave rise to it. There is no doubt that in any movement towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the highest priority should be given to these humanitarian questions.

Israel's treatment of these territories is described in an interesting article called "The Israelis as Occupiers" that appeared in the London Daily Telegraph a few days ago, on April 30, from a Special Correspondent. I shall

quote a few extracts from it:

"Israel's occupation of conquered territories has, in general, been the most humane and generous in modern history, even more so than the American occupation of Japan after World War II. And this is proving to be very good practical politics. ...

Failure of the Al Fatah guerrilla movement, based in Jordan, to achieve any major results in Israeli-occupied territory, is also significant. The fantastically absurd claims of Fatah "victories" broadcast from Arab capitals are a sorry joke among the Arabs under Israel. To date, the men who swagger around Amman terrorising the merchants for cash hand-outs have achieved no major military advantage. They have failed to establish guerrilla bases on the West Bank.

Economic conditions for Arabs in the occupied territories are improving. Many of them, even the professional refugees, are better off than they have every been before. ...

Arab wages are rising to a level set by Israeli trade unions. Administration of Arab affairs is still handled by the same mayors and officials who were there before the June war. Most of them admit in private conversation that they have more freedom of movement and expression today than they had under King Hussein's rule. ...

On its record so far Israel can have a clear conscience before the United Nations or any other international bar on its handling of the occupied Arab territories."

There are some delegates here who have recently been to Israel and can confirm the validity of the "Daily Telegraph" account. All other delegates at this Conference, including the Arab delegates, are welcome to come and see for themselves the situation on the ground. I would not suggest that there are no security problems in combating terrorism, or that all the Arab population is contented, or even that it wishes to remain indefinitely under Israel control. But, having regard to all the circumstances, the degree of normalcy, and peaceful cooperation is astonishing, and a genuine tribute to the humane and positive character of the Israel administration. This is for us

not only a matter of principle but also one of enlightened self-interest. Oppression and ill-treatment would be self-defeating, for it would only increase Arab hostility against Israel. We wish to demonstrate that despite the history of conflict, Jew and Arab can live together in amity in the region we share. That lesson is being learnt between the two-and-a-half million Jews and one-and-a-half million Arabs in the Israel administered area, and that is the most hopeful augury for a better future. Whatever may be our faults and mistakes, it is false and unwarranted to talk of Israel's violation of or disregard for human rights, as the draft resolution in document L.19 tries to do.

III. The Jewish Minorities in the Area

It has been pointed out that civilians in the whole area of conflict, including the Arab States, come within the purview of the United Nations resolutions and the Secretary-General's task of reporting.

My delegation accuses the Governments of Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Iraq of flagrantly violating human rights, in relation to their Jewish civilians. In 1948, Jordanian forces occupied the West Bank area and the Old City of Jerusalem; the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and every Jewish village in the occupied area were destroyed; and their inhabitants were butchered or carried off. Not one single Jew resided in the Kingdom of Jordan from 1948 onwards.

In Egypt, Syria and Iraq, the ancient and peaceful Jewish communities, going back for centuries, became the scapegoat for Arab defeat and frustration. From 1948, they were discriminated against, persecuted, threatened, in most cases deprived of their property and livelihood, and forced to leave their native lands. By June 1967, these communities had shrunken in Egypt from 80,000 to 2,500; in Iraq from 15,000 to 3,000.

The State of Israel has since 1948 absorbed half a million Jewish refugees from the Arab world. This is about the same number as the Arab refugees who left territory that became part of Israel -- so there has in effect been a rough exchange of minorities.

In the wake of the Six Day War of 1967, the remnants of the Jewish communities in Egypt, Syria and Iraq suffered fresh ill-treatment and suffering. My delegation has already placed before the Conference, in previous interventions, the facts about Cairo and Damascus. The Syrian representative has told us that Mr. Gussing was allowed to talk to a few Jews, who did not complain to him. That is hardly surprising, given the kind of regime that exists in Syria. Amongst other measures, Jews are forbidden to leave the country, and have to bear identity cards with the word "Jew" inscribed on them in red.

After the June 1967 War, Jews in Iraq were once more boycotted and dismissed from jobs; numbers of them were arrested; their property was sequestrated; Jewish students expelled from universities and schools.

I have here the English and Arabic texts of Iraqui Law No. 10 of 1968, published in the Iraqui Government Gazette No. 1542 dated 3 March 19 8. Its title is "Amending Law Supplementary to Law for the Supervision and Management of the Properties of the Denationalised Jews, No. 12 of 1951."

The law instructs the authorities concerned to abstain from carrying out or registering any transaction relating to immovable property belonging to a Jew, unless the Minister of the Interior expressly allows it. Even then, the proceeds must be placed in a blocked bank account. This law renders more stringent Amending Law Number 64 of 1967, adopted just after the Six Day War. These laws simply continue the process of seizing Jewish property, begun after the 1948 war.

Mr. President,

It is these Arab Governments that have come here to accuse Israel of a disregard for human rights. The adage about "people in glass houses" applies forcefully.

In conclusion, my delegation would make some initial observations on Draft Resolution L. 19, submitted by the delegations of Mali and Spain. It is not surprising that a number of the delegations that

originally considered co-sponsoring it, have refused to do so. It is a hopelessly slanted and unworthy proposal.

For instance, in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, the United Nations resolutions are carefully paraphrased so as to avoid mentioning that they apply to all the States in the area of conflict; on the contrary, it is implied that those resolutions were addressed only to the Government of Israel.

In the next paragraph, the question of the status of Jerusalem is slipped in by the back-door, though it has nothing to do with this Conference and has not even been discussed.

In the last part of the preamble, a reference to a telegram from the Human Rights Commission is edited so as to omit the fact that the Commission was relying not on verified facts but on newspaper reports. It was an unfortunate lapse on the part of the Commission, when it let itself be pushed into telling the government of a sovereign member-State to "desist forthwith" from security measures the Commission had read about in the press.

It is this kind of hasty and ill-considered action that the Conference is now being asked to take by the draft resolution before us.

The first two operative paragraphs contain a sweeping generalisation that human rights are being violated in Arab territories, and that the Government of Israel must be told of the grave consequences resulting from alleged disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights.

What is the evidence for this judgment the Conference is asked to pronounce? It is not supported by the documents cited in the preamble, nor by any independent inquiry. On the contrary, the Secretary-General, when faced with "allegations and concerns" about the treatment of civilians in the area, made clear that he lacked the necessary facts for reporting, and would send someone to the area for this purpose. My delegation rejects and repudiates these paragraphs. We have been at some pains to give the Conference an account of Israel's

administration of the territories. It is a creditable record. We find it hard to imagine that any fair-minded and unprejudiced delegation would fail to oppose this draft resolution.

The second draft resolution, L. , submitted by the delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay, is of a completely different nature. It deals with broad principles, and as regards the Middle East, confines itself to noting the action being taken by the Secretary-General, without attempting to draw any premature and unwarranted conclusions.

The contrast between the two draft resolutions, in substance and spirit, is a striking one, and it strongly reveals the wholly partisan character of draft resolution L. 19.

Thank you, Madame President.

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

6 May 1968.

Teheran Conference

cc Stencil but Tattered. Draft

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay

Chairman of the Israel Delegation

on 6 May 1968

Madam President,

At the outset of the debate on this item, my delegation appealed for a "cease-fire" in the discussion of local Middle East issues, that are being dealt with anyway by the appropriate United Nations organs. The item before us is worded in general terms, and we agreed with those many delegations who wished to have it debated in general terms. Our appeal was spurned by Arab delegations who have insisted on using this item as a peg for anti-Israel propaganda, and solely for that purpose. My delegation reserved the right to set the record straight, if that should be necessary, and we are now obliged to do so. We shall make a full and factual statement, covering the following points:

(a) The circumstances under which Israel forces occupied certain territories;

(b) The past and present conditions of the civilian population in Israel-administered territories;

(c) The situation of Jewish minorities in certain Arab countries in the area of conflict.

I How Israel Occupation came About

It is a matter of history that in 1948 the Arab States rejected the United Nations solution for the Palestine problem and invaded the country in order to destroy the infant State of Israel by force of arms. During that war, the Arab armies were repulsed, but established military occupation of certain areas of the country. As a result, Egypt remained in possession of the Gaza Strip and Jordan of the so-called West Bank area,

Dear Jerry, Don't

which it later annexed.

Despite United Nations peace-making efforts, the Arab governments refused to accept the State of Israel as a fact, and maintained their policy of belligerency against it - a policy that produced three Israel-Arab wars in nineteen years. The last of these was the Six-Day War of June 1967.

Arab spokesmen, and those of certain other countries that are their political patrons and allies, have repeatedly made two assertions about the territories held by Israel: firstly, that they were occupied by aggression, and secondly, that the United Nations has called upon Israel to withdraw from them unconditionally. As I shall show from the record, both these Arab-Soviet assertions have been firmly rejected by the United Nations itself. Let us take a look at the resolutions dealt with by the United Nations, on these two questions.

The cease-fire resolutions of 6, 7, 9 and 12 June 1967 refrain from indicating responsibility for the hostilities or calling for a withdrawal of troops, in spite of Arab-Soviet efforts to insert such provisions.

The USSR draft resolution of 14 June which alleged Israel aggression and called for withdrawal was decisively rejected by the Security Council.

The USSR then called for a Special Emergency Session of the General Assembly, and submitted to it another anti-Israel resolution (A/L519), which was just as decisively rejected. Far from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority, none of its provisions could even obtain a simple majority - in fact the hard core of support for it was about 36 votes - almost exclusively from the Arab group, the Soviet bloc and of some delegations identified with the Arab cause. The overwhelming majority of uncommitted and objective member-States refused to give credence to the Arab-Soviet version of the war, the crisis that preceded it and the action that should be taken after it.

That was not surprising. The dramatic events of May and June of 1967 were still too fresh and vivid in the public mind for history to be re-written.

In the weeks preceding June 5, the world had watched with impotent dread the massing of Arab armies for what was going to be the final liquidation of the State of Israel. In the Sinai desert, on Israel's exposed southern border, a huge Egyptian invasion force was concentrated from May 14, consisting of over 90,000 men, 900 tanks, 800 heavy guns and 400 war planes. The Egyptian tank force was larger and had far greater striking power than the combined armour of Montgomery and Rommel in the Battle of Alamein.

On May 18, the United Nations and the world were stunned to learn that Egypt had demanded the instant removal of UNEF, the United Nations Peace Force, which for ten years had been patrolling the border along the Gaza Strip and the Sinai desert, and had been stationed at the entrance to the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, the sea-way to Israel's southern port of Eilat. On 22 May, President Nasser proclaimed a blockade of this southern sea route. On 26 May, President Nasser declared: "I know that by concentrating my troops and by blockading Israel I invite war. I am ready for it. The Arab people want to fight. Our strength is sufficient, and with God's help we will be able to win."

In case there was any doubt about the matter, Cairo Radio explained the same day that the intention was "to wipe Israel off the map". In every mosque there was proclaimed the Jihad, the holy war against Israel. The television screens depicted frenzied mobs roaming through the streets of Cairo and Damascus, screaming with blood-lust. On 30 May, King Hussein flew to Cairo, signed a military pact and placed the Jordan Army under Egyptian command for the coming battle. President Nasser announced: This deed will astound the world. Today they will know that the Arabs are ready for the fray. The hour of decision has arrived." The next day, Iraq concluded a similar pact with Egypt. Iraqi forces started moving into Jordan, and the Iraqi Defence Minister declared that all the men of the army had

been looking forward ± for 20 years to the moment when they could enter the campaign together with the rest of the Arab armies. In Damascus, there was special rejoicing. For several years, the Syrian government had been pressing hard for a combined Arab attack on Israel, and now the hour seemed to have struck.

The mood of the Arab world before the battle is vividly illustrated in a collection of cartoons from the Arab press in those weeks. They depict Israel as a vicious stereotype straight out of the Nazi "Der Stuermer" - a small, hook-nosed cringing creature begging for mercy as the gallant Arab soldiers shoot, blast, stab, crush, smash, guillotine, hand, club and throttle it, and drown it in the sea. Some of the same capacity for fantasy and wish-fulfilment, the same semantic intoxication, is now at work in the Arab propaganda picture of life in the Israel administered territories. That picture is a gross perversion of reality.

Israel was in dealy peril, and the whole nation mobilized to fight for its physical survival. The way they fought is known to all. Hostilities broke out on Monday, 5 June and by Saturday, the Arab armies had been smashed one by one. It is not surprising that after the event the opinion of mankind, as reflected at the United Nations, understood clearly who it was that had recklessly plunged the Middle East into war, and refused to accept the astonishing thesis that the Arab countries were the innocent victims of alleged Israel ~~xgxkx~~ aggression.

As has been said a number of times at this Conference, there is an intimate relationship between peace and human rights. Wars produce death, displacement and destruction. Let those who launched the Middle East war - let those who go on preaching more war in the future - pause to reflect what human suffering they have caused and may cause again.

I have sketched the background to the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, that received unanimous support. The resolution says nothing about aggression and does not attempt to place the responsibility for the conflict on either side. It places the question of withdrawal squarely in the context of establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including recognized and secure frontiers between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. Till now, no such frontiers have come into existence since the establishment of the State of Israel. My country wants a just and lasting peace, and is willing to exchange the existing cease-fire lines for recognized and secure frontiers, as soon as those frontiers are agreed upon as part of a peace settlement. Until such time we shall to the best of our ability administer the area on our side of the cease-fire lines, and discharge our responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of all the inhabitants of that area.

II Return to Normal Life

At the end of the fighting and the establishment of the cease-fire lines by the Security Council, Israel unexpectedly found itself in possession of territories containing about a million Arabs. Under conditions of a collapse of public services, economic life and local security, and administration had to be improvised over-night, and normal living restored as rapidly as possible. This was accomplished with remarkable speed and success. What helped was that the Israel Army is made up mainly of civilian reservists, and was able to draw on the services of mobilized administrators, engineers, economists and farm experts. In addition, each of the Israel Government Ministries concerned attached its representatives to the Military Governors; day to day civilian policy was guided by a committee of Directors-General of Ministries, responsible to a Cabinet Committee.

and a

The immediate task was to restore essential services, disrupted/by the war. By September, such public services as water, electricity, santitation and functioning transport were ~~running~~ normally, and shortages of certain food-stuffs such as fresh fruit and vegetables, milk and meat had been remedied from Israel's stocks. ~~Exit~~ Attention was then concentrated on restoring business activity, solving the problem of marketing~~x~~ farm surpluses, ~~xndngnxxx

The population of thexm four Israel-held territories is as follows: (in round figures)

The West Bank	600,000
The Gaza Strip	360,000 ~~xxx,xxx~~
~~xxxx~~Northern Sinai	33,000
Golan Heights	6,000

The Sinai desert is virtually ~~xxx~~ ix uninhabited. In the Golan Heights, the Arab population migrated deeper into Syria during the fighting, and only some Druze villages were left. These Druze were never politically or culturally integrated in Syria; and/have they joined the Druze community inside Israel, and give rise to no difficulties. More needs to be said about the two territories that have a substantial population, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

The Gaza Strip

In an earlier intervention, my delegation putx on record some of the facts about the Gaza Strip. As has already been mentioned, this territory was occupied by Egyptian forces in the 1948 ~~xxx~~ fighting. But it was never allowed to become part of Egyptian life and economy, and remained isolated and ~~xxxxxxxx~~ stagnant. The main purpose it served for Egypt was a military one - first as a base for ~~xxxxx~~ raiding into Israel, and later as a recruiting and training centre for Palestinian brigades of the Egyptian army. When it came under our control in the June war, we found that its economy had rested mainly on large-scale smuggling, the funds spent by UNRWA and foreign relief agencies, the exploitation of cheap labour by the Egyptian authorities, family remittances from other Arab countries, labour employed by the U.N. peace force, which was kicked out shortly before the war, and some citrus growing and ~~xxxxxx~~ fishing. The local water resources had been wastefully used and were close to exhaustion and salinity. Industry was non-existent. Cash deposits in the banks had been removed to Egypt before the fighting started.

The Israel authorities have been making determined efforts to improve living conditions in the Strip. By the end of the budgetary year in March, IL. 35 million had been poured into the Strip in loans and subsidies, to stimulate economic activity and create employment. In addition, purchases by visitors from Israel totalled about IL. 10 million. Thousands of workers are being employed in the repair of roads, bridges and damaged buildings; their minimum wages have been doubled and their hours of work laid down at eight hours, for the first time. The citrus groves and fishing fleet have been rehabilitated with the help of Israel grants and loans, and in both cases the output is now well above pre-war levels. The total citrus crop has been sold abroad with the assistance of the Israel Citrus Marketing Board. The health services have been much improved, with the Palestinian doctors and nurses being given facilities for more advanced training, and being taken on visits to Israel health institutions, plans are about to be put into effect for expanding trade schools and work shops, and providing vocational skills for adult workers. Another important development is that Gaza residents are now able to travel around freely in Israel and the West Bank, or to cross over to East Jordan for temporary visits, or to stay if they wish. The ghetto walls of Gaza have tumbled down for good.

The West Bank

The West Bank area was occupied in 1948 by Jordanian forces, in defiance of United Nations decisions on Palestine. After that Jordan went through the motions of annexation, but for 19 years the West Bank remained an occupied territory, without Jordanian absorption of it being recognized by the outside world, even by other Arab States. The inhabitants never became fully reconciled to being ruled from Amman. The history of Jordanian control of the territory before June 1967 was a more disturbed one than its history under Israel control since then, just to take the most recent period before the war: in January 1966, the Jordanian authorities

arrested 200 persons in Jericho; in April, they arrested 2,000 residents of the West Bank; in May, mass demonstrations against the government took place in Jerusalem, Chebron and Ramallah, and were suppressed by force, with the schools closed down and hundreds of persons jailed. In July, disturbances and mass demonstrations broke out again in Nablus, with tear-gas used by the police, twleve persons injured and 250 arrested. In November and December there were a series of disturbances and clashes in the area, with the Jordanian army repeatedly called upon to suppress demonstrations enforce curfews, and even, on 8 December, break a general business strike by force. On January 13, 1967, Jordanian military units had to surround Nablus and break their way in through barricades erected by the citizens. By comparison with what went before, the relations between the Israel administration and the local population of the area have been cooperative/free of trouble. This can be confirmed by the hundreds of thousands of Israeli residents, foreign tourists, diplomats, newspaper correspondents and others who travel around the area every day in complete freedom, and comment on the fact that Israel army units or military vehicles are seldom seen.

Economically, the West Bank area was the step-child of Jordan. For internal political reasons, East Jordan was favoured at the expense of West Jordan, which before 1948 had been the more prosperous and developed area of the two. Under Jordan occupation the West Bank had almost half the population, but accounted for only one-third of the output. Economically, the East Bank enjoyed complete priority of investment and development, and all the country's sizable industries were located there. Per capita income in East Jordan was 335 dollars and in the West Bank 216. The West Bank was left with 22% of Jordan's industry and 16% of her transport.

Under Israel control, a major effort has been made to revive and develop the economic life on the West Bank. Fifty percent of the population supports itself by farming. In less than a year, agriculture is already beginning to receive a new impetus. A system of production councils have been set-up

for specific products. Scientific crop-planning has been introduced and new types of crops such as cotton. Arabic speaking Israeli instructors have been running special courses and field days for local farmers, more than 8,000 of whom have already received instruction in modern cultivation techniques, irrigation systems, agricultural implements, fertilizers, insecticides and seeding. They are able to visit and learn from the Arab farm villages in Israel, where the farm output has on the average increased six-fold in two decades.

All handicrafts and small local industries are working at full production. In urban and professional occupations, salaries have been increased, family allowances introduced, and office hours and annual leave regulated. There are 7,000 Arab personnel presently on the salary rolls of the Israel administration on the West Bank including 34,000 teachers and 300 policemen.

Before the war, a great deal of the farm produce of the West Bank was exported to the East Bank, and to Arab countries beyond. This flow of produce was soon resumed with the encouragement of the Israel authorities, and a daily average of more than one hundred truck loads crossed the Jordan River eastwards, over Bailey Bridges constructed jointly by Israel and Jordan army engineers, alongside the bridges destroyed in the fighting. The value of the produce that has crossed the Jordan River eastwards by now is estimated at $15,000,000.

The movement of goods is accompanied by the movement of people. Thousands of persons cross at Allenby Bridge on temporary permits issued to them by the Israel authorities, and come back again after one or more weeks, to quote the foreign editor of the London Financial Times "The fact remains that for the first time ever, the Arabs are travelling in large numbers to and fro between Israeli and Arab territory. . . . It is a development arguably more important than any of the other aspects of the Middle East situation . . . Some 30,000 people have already taken advantage of this and presumably they can and do report to the East Bank that they are not being slaughtered by the Israelis, that the West Bank is prospering, that the El Fatah terrorists are making no serious impact on the life of the West Bank."

One might add that the West Bank residents, the Gaza residents, and the Israelis are all travelling around freely to all parts of the total area held by Israel, and this is without doubt having a revolutionary effect on their feelings and attitudes. The Arabs in these territories have different political views about their future, and express them without any inhibitions. But one ~~thing~~ sentiment they all hold in common - they no longer want war and conflict with Israel, but peace and co-existence with Israel. They have found to their own surprise and resentment that their own leaders and propaganda machines have grossly mislead them. The Israelis with whom they now mingle are ~~xxtx~~ neither the ~~killers~~ murderers and oppressors nor the squirming ~~xxrx~~ cowards they have been lead to believe, but decent and creative human beings, with whom these Arabs can live in peace and dignity . ~~x~~ That is the shattering development to which the Arab Governments and spokesmen cannot reconcile themselves. That is the source of the compulsion which drives the spokesmen of these governments in to such a frantic effort to persuade the world that the Israelis are brutal, that they are committing atrocities, that they are trampling on human rights. That compulsion has been much in evidence at this Conference in Teheran.

One form it takes is to promote sneak raids across the cease-fire lines by terrorists and to try and dress up this activity as a resistance movement by the local populations against Israel occupiers. That picture is totally false, because no such resistance movement exists in Israel-held territories. Nor ~~is~~ was this ~~xxxx~~ kind of border warfare born out of the Six-Day War. We have been accustomed to periods of such ~~xxxxxxxx~~ organized terrorism, whenever the Arab countries around us shrank from a direct military confrontation with Israel. One such period was ~~xxxxxxx~~ from 1953 to 1956, when the murderous fedayeen raids ~~xxxxx~~ deep into Israel territory were organized by the Egyptian authorities from the Gaza Strip. That form of armed attack led directly to the Sinai Campaign of October 1956, and the occupation of the Gaza Strip by Israel at that time. For a decade after that the Israel-Egyptian border remained quiet, for the simple reason that raiding by armed terrorists and

and saboteurs was regarded as too dangerous, while Egypt was building up its ~~military~~ strength for a future military showdown with Israel. But a few years later, in the sixties, the same type of operation was launched by the Syrian regime, under the name of "The People's War". As a rule, the terrorist squads, trained and equipped by Syria were sent into Israel across the Jordan and Lebanese borders. For several years these incursions across the border, and Israel's ~~x~~ occasional reaction to them, was the central theme of Security Council debates on the ~~danger~~ tension and danger to peace in the Middle East. I was myself at that time my country's representative to the United Nations, and on a number of occasions presented details of these organized guerilla activities to the Security Council. Every definition of aggression that has ever been suggested at the United Nations includes this type of activity (Quote Russian definition)

One final comment on this ~~xxxx~~ point. ~~With~~ The present El Fatah terrorists, like ~~xxxx~~ their predecessors, in the years before June 1967, or ~~xxxx~~ the ~~fmix~~ fedayun from the Gaza Strip, maybe lauded as heroes. We regard them as cowardly murderers, who sneak in under cover of darkness to put dynamite under the homes of sleeping farmers' families, or place mines on roads where bus-loads of children can be blown up, or throw hand-grenades into crowded market-places and run away. ~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ Our European friends ~~xxxxx~~ have their own recollections of the heroism of the resistance ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ but there is nothing in common between the two movements. Let me quote a resolution adopted by the International Union of Resistance Movements and Deportation Victims, at its conference in Brussels from the 31 March to 2 April, of this year.

It declares that nobody should be permitted to compare the spirit of the resistance movements with terrorist acts and odious crimes which aim at blindly creating insecurity and fear, and provoking violence, at a time when every opportunity is being publicly offered for a genuine discussion of all matters in dispute. The resolution expresses a sense of outrage and insult at comparing Nazism with the courageous defence by the citizens of Israel of their right to exist.

It is also worth mentioning that the border areas where this terrorist activity is marked are not the areas occupied by Israel in June 1967, but those districts such as the Beisan Valley and the Negev in the south, that have always been part of the State of Israel.

Religion

One of the most important gains of the Six-Day War is in the field of religious rights and liberties. For 19 years of Jordanian occupation, no single Jew was allowed access to the most sacred holy place of our religion, the Western Wall in the Old City, although this was a right expressly guaranteed by the 1949 Armistice Agreement. In general, the Jordanian behaviour towards the Jews was barbaric. During the fighting of 1948, the inhabitants of the ancient Jewish quarter of the Old City, and of Jewish villages like the Etzion Bloc near Chebron, were slaughtered or carried off as captives. The Jewish quarter itself was destroyed, and not a single one of its 35 synagogues left intact. The cemetary on the Mount of Olives, where Jews have been buried since times imemorial has been completely desecrated and tens of thousands of tombstones smashed or carted off to be used for buildings, army camps and even latrines. A limited number of Christian Arabs in Israel were allowed to cross to Bethlehem twice a year, but no Arab Moslems from Israel were allowed to go on pilgramage to Mecca, the Egyptian authorities would not permit from their to go to Mecca

All this injustice has been remedied since the June war. Within weeks of the cease-fire, on 27 June 1967, the Knesset (the Israel Parliament) adopted a law for the protection of all holy and sacred places, and guaranteeing complete freedom of access for the members of every religion to the places sacred to them. For the first time in twenty years there is complete freedom of worship, of access and of pilgrimage for all faiths in the Holy Land.

Refugees

Immediately after the fighting, the Israel Government proposed to UNRWA to continue its work in the areas concerned, and signed an agreement of cooperation with the Agency, as the Commissioner-General, Dr. Michelmore reported to the last session of the General Assembly, this cooperation has been satisfactory. UNRWA has been given every facility and assistance for continuing its humanitarian task in Israel-held areas.

One of the matters which the Commissioner-General has stressed in his reports has been the substantial movement of persons from the West Bank area to East Jordan and beyond. This was initially a flight from during the fighting, which on the Jordan front lasted only 72 hours. Since then, there has been an orderly and voluntary movement for a variety of reasons - partly family ties; partly economic, because of sources of income in Jordan or remittances from elsewhere in the Arab world; partly psychological, because of uncertainty about the future, and the pressures on West Bank Arabs from Amman not to cooperate with the Israeli authorities. Of recent months, the movement from West Bank has become negligible, though there is a small-scale movement from the Gaza Strip. The policy of the Israel Government has been that it has no right to keep anyone in Israel-held territory against his will. None of these people have been driven out, as is alleged from Arab sources.

As the Conference is aware, the United Nations resolutions requested the Israel Government to facilitate the return of those who have wished to come back. The Israel Government has been willing to do so, subject to the overall security situation, which does not permit of an uncontrolled mass influx. Last year, my Government proposed

a repatriation scheme, with the cooperation of the International Red Cross. Under this scheme, 21,000 persons were issued with permits to return, but only 14,000 of them actually appeared. The Israel Government then proposed finding and bringing back the other 7,000, but this was not carried out because of Jordanian non-cooperation - in fact Jordanian representatives failed even to show up at a meeting arranged by the Red Cross to discuss the matter. No doubt much larger numbers might have been authorized at that time, if the Jordan Government had not tried to exploit a humanitarian gesture for political and security purposes, and especially by inciting the returnees to obstruct and undermine the Israel administration. Subsequently, the Israel Government again took the initiative in launching another repatriation project based on the re-union of families and hardship cases. This project too was carried out at first with the cooperation of the International Red Cross, until two Red Cross representatives were wounded by Jordanian fire at the Allenby Bridge. The Israel Government is proceeding on its own. Applications for the return of their relatives are made by West Bank families through their own local authorities. The approved names are then broadcast, and every Monday and Thursday morning groups of these returnees appear at the bridge and are permitted to enter. Indeed, the Allenby Bridge has become one of the busiest and most curious transit points in the region.

My Government and people are sensitive to the humanitarian problems of refugees, and will try to ease them to the extent that the situation allows. Unfortunately the problem of displacement cannot entirely be divorced from the situation which gave rise to it. There is no doubt that in any movement towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the highest priority should be given to these humanitarian questions. As for the 1948 refugees in the area we control, my government will do its best to ensure their welfare and economic integration, pending an overall political settlement, which would include a solution of the refugee problem, in terms of the Security Council resolution of November 22, given peaceful conditions and regional cooperation, we feel confident that this long-standing problem

will also find a constructive solution. The Israel Government is prepared to make its maximum contribution to such a solution.

Israel's treatment of these territories is praised in an interesting article called "The Israelis as Occupiers" that appeared in the London Daily Telegraph a few days ago, on April 30, from a special correspondent. I shall quote a few extracts from it: . . . "Israel's occupation of conquered territories has, in general, been the most humane and generous in modern history, even more so than the American occupation of Japan after World War II. And this is proving to be very good pradical politics. . . .

Failure of the Al Fatah guerrilla movement, based in Jordan, to achieve any major results in Israeli-occupied territory, is also significant. The fantastically absurd claims of Fatah "victories" broadcast from Arab capitals are a sorry joke among the Arabs under Israel. To date, the men who swagger around Amman terrorising the merchants for cash hand-outs have achieved no major military advantage. They have failed to establish guerrilla bases on the West Bank.

Economic conditions for Arabs in the occupied territories are improving. Many of them, even the professional refugees, are better of than they have ever been before.

War Weariness

Arab wages are rising to a level set by Israeli trade unions. Administration of Arab affairs is still handled by the same mayors and officials who were there before the June war. Most of them admit in private conversation that they have more freedom of movement and expression today than they had under King Hussein's rule. . . .

On its record so far Israel can have a clear conscience before the United Nations or any other international bar on its handling of the occupied Arab territories."

III The Jewish Minorities in the Area

It has been pointed out that the civilians in the whole area of conflict, including the Arab States, come within the purview of the United Nations resolutions and the Secretary-General's task of reporting. ~~It is~~ Why the Secretary-General addressed himself to the treatment meted out to the small and helpless Jewish communities in several Arab States is the ~~clearest~~ violation of human rights that has occurred in the whole area.

~~In my delegation has in a previous intervention, my duty~~

To repeat, the Security Council resolution recommends to the Governments concerned the scrupulous respect of the humanitarian principles governing the treatment of the protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Contained in the Geneva Convention of 12th August 1949.

My delegation accuses the Governments of ~~Egypt~~, Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Iraq of flagrantly violating ~~of~~ ~~human~~ human rights, in relation to their Jewish civilians. ~~humanitarian principles~~. ~~This~~ ~~In 1948 Jordan overran~~ the In 1948 Jordanian forces occupied the West Bank area and the Old City of Jerusalem; ~~destroyed~~ the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and every Jewish village in the were destroyed; occupied area & and their inhabitants were butchered or ~~carried off~~. Not one single Jew resided. ~~remained~~ in ~~Jordan~~ the Kingdom of Jordan from 1948 onwards. ~~to 1967~~.

~~My delegation has already given this conference the facts about the~~

The Jews in Egypt, Syria and Iraq and Yemen
the ancient Jewish communities,
going back for ~~2000 years~~
25 centuries, became the
scapegoat for Arab defeat and
frustration from 1948. ~~Subjected to~~
were persecuted discriminated against,
persecuted, threatened, in most
cases deprived of their property and
livelihood, ~~As a result, they were~~
~~and other expelled or encouraged~~
and forced to flee their native lands.
Countries. ~~In Egypt~~ By June, 1967,
these communities had ~~the~~
shrunken in Egypt from 80,000 to
2,500; in Iraq from 130,000
to 3,000; in Syria from
15,000 to 3,000. ~~Also Algeria~~,
~~from Libya~~ The State of Israel
has since 1948 absorbed half a

million Jewish refugees from the Arab world. This is ~~roughly~~ about the same number as the Arab refugees who left territory that became part of Israel — so there has in effect been a rough exchange of minorities.

In the wake of the Six Day War of 1967, the remnants of the Jewish communities in Egypt, Syria and Iraq suffered ~~fresh~~ ill-treatment and suffering. My delegation has already placed before the Conference, in previous interventions, the facts about Cairo, ~~Alexandria~~ and Damascus. The Syrian representative has told us that his Russian ~~was~~ allowed to talk to a few Jews, who did not complain to him. That is hardly surprising, ~~as the Police state~~ ~~for example~~ given the

Racist regime that exists in Syria.
Amongst other measures, Jews are forbidden to leave the
~~Iraq, official incitement~~ country, and
~~against Jews was carried on~~ have to bear identity
~~on the radio and TV.~~ cards with
the word
"Jew" inscribed on
them in red.

After the June, 1967 War ~~in Iraq~~ Jews in Iraq once more
~~dismissed from jobs;~~ became boycotted; ~~arrested~~ members of
them were arrested; their property
was sequestrated; ~~students~~ Jewish students expelled
from universities and schools. ~~A~~
~~Red Cross official~~ The Jews in Iraq
~~were also forbidden to leave.~~

I have here the ~~text of~~
English and Arabic texts of ~~an~~
Iraqui Law No 10 of 1968,
published in the Iraqui Government
Gazette of No 1542 of dated
3 March, 1968. Its title is
"Amending Law Supplementary to
Law for the Supervision and Management
of the Properties of the Denotionalised
Jews, No 12 of 1951".

The law instructs the authorities concerned to abstain from carrying out or registering any transaction relating to immovable property belonging to a Jew, unless the Minister of the Interior expressly allows it. Even then, the proceeds must be placed in a blocked bank account. This law ~~follows and~~ renders more stringent, ~~as~~ Amending law ~~adopted~~ was number 64 of 1967, adopted ~~on 28 June, 1967~~, just after the Six Day War.

These laws simply continue the process of seizing Jewish property, begun in ~~in~~ after the 1948 war. ~~Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of Jewish property has been confiscated in Iraq, without any compensation payments have been made.~~

Mr President,

It is these Arab governments that have come here to accuse Israel of a disregard for human rights. The adage about "people in glass houses" applies forcefully.

Space

In conclusion, my delegation would make some initial observations on the Draft resolution L.19, submitted by the delegations of Mali and Spain. It is not surprising that a number of the delegations that originally considered sponsoring it, have refused to do so. It is a hopelessly slanted and unworthy proposal. ~~and it is hard to imagine any impartial fair-minded delegation giving it support.~~

For instance, in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, the United Nations resolutions are carefully paraphrased so as to avoid mentioning that they apply to all the states in the area of conflict; ~~or that Israel is entrusted with responsibility for the safety, welfare and security on~~ the contrary, it is implied that those resolutions were addressed only to the government of Israel.

In the next paragraph, the question of the status of Jerusalem is slipped in by the back-door, though it has nothing to do with this Conference and has not even been discussed.

In the last par of the preamble, a reference to a telegram from the Human Rights Commission is edited so as to omit the fact that the Commission was relying not on verified facts but on newspapes reports. It ~~in fact~~ was an

unfortunate lapse on the part of the Commission, when it let itself be ~~has~~ pushed into ~~advocating~~ telling the government of a sovereign member-State to "desist forthwith" from ~~doing something~~ security measures the Commission had read about in the press. # It is this kind of hasty and ill-considered action that the Conference is now being asked to take by the ~~resolut~~ draft resolution before us. # The first two operative paragraphs contain a sweeping generalisation that human rights are being violated in Arab territories, and that in the Government of Israel must be held * of the grave consequences ~~that~~ resulting from ~~this~~ ~~disregard~~ alleged disregard of fundamental freedoms and ~~this "judgment"~~ human rights. ~~the Conference is asked to make~~

against a member-State is not ~~based~~ ~~justified~~ based

What is the evidence for this ~~for reaching~~ judgment the Conference is asked to pronounce? It is not supported by the documents cited in the preamble, nor by any independent inquiry. On the contrary, the Secretary-General, when faced with allegations and concerns about the treatment of the civilians in the area, made clear that he ~~was not in~~ a ~~position to~~ lacked the necessary facts ~~and~~ for reporting, and would send someone to the area for this purpose. ~~And~~ My delegation rejects and repudiates these paragraphs. We have been at some pains to give

The conference on account of Israel's administration ~~stewardship~~ of the ~~territories~~. It is a ~~a tour de force~~ creditable record. ~~It~~ ~~under the circumstances~~ ~~cannot imagine~~ We find it hard to imagine that any fair-minded and unprejudiced delegation would ~~be loth~~ fail to oppose ~~itself to~~ this resolution draft resolution.

The ~~two~~ second draft resolution, L, submitted by the delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay, is of a completely different nature. ~~in strong contrast to the first one~~. It deals with broad principles, and as regards the middle East, confines itself to noting the action ~~taken~~ being taken by the Secretary-General, without attempting to draw any premature and unwarranted conclusions.

The ~~contrast~~ between the ~~text~~ two draft resolutions, in ~~less~~ substance and spirit, is a striking one, and it ~~proves~~ strongly reveals the wholly partisan character of draft resolution L.19.

Insert p. 14.

(a)

~~At the first~~ At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA ~~the~~ the long-standing question of ~~racial~~ incitement and inflammatory ~~hostile~~ propaganda in ~~school~~ school ~~text~~-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities ~~from the text-books in~~ in Government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. ~~Some~~ UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which cooperates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have

Junta delegada

been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and cooperation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the Unesco resolution

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regards is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083). It is headed

"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (E.S. V)"

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In these Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources."

"The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up-to-date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing, ~~with the concurrence of the Israel Government,~~ went

Insert p. 3.

I would draw attention to the phrases "up-to-date" "once again", "at this time" and so on. ~~This underlies~~ ~~that~~ It is clearly indicated that the fact-finding mission carried out by Amb. Gussing in July 1967, a few weeks after ~~hostilities~~ the cease-fire, ~~is~~ out-of-date and that there is no reason ~~why~~ available depicting ~~does not dep~~ cannot ~~be relied~~ upon to depict the current situation, ~~which~~ a ~~year~~ later.

to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967).

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

Insert

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General

has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put x into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be ~~be~~ submitted on the substance of the matter. *

In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, my delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the U.A.R., apart from a general disclaimer.

What we propose ~~in~~ x effect is a cease-fire. ~~The~~ Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in general terms as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. If Arab colleagues reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursing their political offensive, my delegation must reserve the right ~~to explain matters~~ to make a full statement explaining matters, as we see them. That would include dealing fully with the allegations made by the representative of the U.A.R. We still hope that necessity will not arise.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. ~~That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a cease-fire, and we have tried to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.~~

Cont'd from p.1

* That refers specifically to the draft resolution in document L.19. ~~submitted by the delegations of Mali and Spain.~~ I shall come back to this unwarranted ~~resolution in due course~~

~~Tehran Conference~~
Int Conf on H. R.

~~Item 13~~

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay 38
on 6 May, 1968. 14
Chairman of the Israel Delegation
on Agenda Item 12. 16

Corrected Copy 32

Mr. President,

From the beginning ~~of this Conference,~~ my delegation has steadily urged that ~~it~~ this Conference should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. ~~The statement just made by the representative of the U.A.R. confirms that foreboding.~~ It would not be a difficult matter for my delegation to prove the falsity of his charges. But we feel that the affairs of the Middle East have by now been sufficiently ventilated at the Conference, and everyone concerned has had his say. What useful purpose could be served by projecting these disputed questions into the last week of the Conference - especially when the appropriate U.N. bodies are dealing with them anyway?

A number of delegations obviously share our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguished representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill ~~and peace~~ that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

Insert on p. 4.

It seems that no such sympathetic chord was struck in the bosoms of Arab delegations. The item was inscribed; the debate has just been launched with an attack by the representative of the U.A.R.; and an anti-Israel draft resolution has already been tabled. My delegation therefore has no option but to make a full and factual statement concerning the territories held by Israel; without prejudice to our consistent position that this matter is beyond the competence of the Conference. Our statement will cover the following points:

Teheran Conference

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay

Chairman of the Israel Delegation

on May 1968

Madam President,

At the outset of the debate on this item, my delegation appealed for a "cease-fire" in the discussion of local Middle East issues, that are being dealt with anyway by the appropriate United Nations organs. The item before us is worded in general terms, and we agreed with those many delegations who wished to have it debated in general terms. Our appeal was spurned by Arab delegations who have insisted on using this item as a peg for anti-Israel propaganda, and solely for that purpose. My delegation reserved the right to set the record straight, if that should be necessary, and we are now obliged to do so. We shall make a full and factual statement, covering the following points:

(a) The circumstances under which Israel forces occupied these territories;

(b) The past and present conditions of the civilian population in them;

(c) The situation of Jewish minorities in certain Arab countries in the area of conflict.

I How Israel Occupation came About

It is a matter of history that in 1948 the Arab States rejected the United Nations solution for the Palestine problem and invaded the country, in order to destroy the infant State of Israel by force of arms. During that war, the Arab armies were repulsed, but retained military occupation of certain areas of the country. As a result, Egypt remained in possession of the Gaza Strip and Jordan of the so-called West Bank area,

In the weeks preceding June 5, the world had watched with impotent dread the massing of Arab armies for what was going to be the final liquidation of the State of Israel. In the Sinai desert, on Israel's exposed southern border, a huge Egyptian invasion force was concentrated from May 14, consisting of over 90,000 men, 900 tanks, 800 heavy guns and 400 war planes. The Egyptian tank force was larger and had far greater striking power than the combined armour of Montgomery and Rommel in the Battle of Alamein.

On May 18, the United Nations and the world were stunned to learn that Egypt had demanded the instant removal of UNEF, the United Nations Peace Force, ~~which for ten years had been patrolling the border along the Gaza Strip and the Sinai desert, and had been stationed at the entrance to the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, the sea-way to Israel's southern port of Eilat.~~ On 22 May, President Nasser proclaimed a blockade of ~~this~~ the Gulf of Aqaba, the southern sea-route to Israel. On 26 May, President Nasser declared: "I know that by concentrating my troops and by blockading Israel I invite war. I am ready for it. The Arab people want to fight. Our strength is sufficient, and with God's help we will be able to win."

In case there was any doubt about the matter, Cairo Radio explained the same day that the intention was "to wipe Israel off the map". In every mosque there was proclaimed the Jihad, the holy war, ~~against Israel~~. The television screens depicted frenzied mobs roaming through the streets of Cairo and Damascus, screaming with blood-lust. On 30 May, King Hussein flew to Cairo, signed a military pact and placed the Jordan Army under Egyptian command for the coming battle. President Nasser announced: "This deed will astound the world. Today they will know that the Arabs are ready for the fray. The hour of decision has arrived." The next day, Iraq concluded a similar pact with Egypt. Iraqi forces started moving into Jordan, and the Iraqi Defence Minister declared that all the men of the army had

been looking forward ~~x~~ for 20 years to the moment when they could enter the campaign together with the rest of the Arab armies. In Damascus, there was special rejoicing. For several years, the Syrian government had been pressing hard for a combined Arab attack on Israel, and now the hour seemed to have struck.

The mood of the Arab world before the battle is vividly illustrated by ~~in~~ a collection of cartoons from the Arab press in those weeks. They depict Israel as a vicious stereotype straight out of the Nazi "Der Stuermer" - a small, hook-nosed, cringing creature begging for mercy as the gallant Arab soldiers shoot, blast, stab, crush, smash, guillotine, hang, club and throttle it, and drown it in the sea. Some of the same capacity for fantasy and wish-fulfilment, the same semantic intoxication, is now at work in the Arab propaganda picture of life in the Israel administered territories. That picture is a gross perversion of reality. What can be believed is that if the Arab forces had occupied any part of Israel, no Israelis would have been left alive in it.

Israel was in deadly peril, and the whole nation mobilized to fight for its physical survival. The way they fought is known to all. Hostilities broke out on Monday, 5 June and by Saturday, the Arab armies had been smashed one by one. It is not surprising that after the event the opinion of mankind, as reflected at the United Nations, ~~understood clearly who it was that had recklessly plunged the Middle East into war, and~~ refused to accept the astonishing thesis that the Arab countries were the innocent victims of alleged Israel ~~xgxx~~ aggression.

As has been said a number of times at this Conference, there is an intimate relationship between peace and human rights. Wars produce death, displacement and destruction. Let those who launched the Middle East war - let those who go on preaching more war in the future - pause to reflect what human suffering they have caused and may cause again.

I have sketched the background to the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, that received unanimous support. The resolution says nothing about aggression, and does not attempt to place the responsibility for the conflict on either side. It places the question of withdrawal squarely in the context of establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including recognized and secure frontiers between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. Till now, no such frontiers have come into existence since the establishment of the State of Israel, which existed only between brittle armistice lines. My country wants a just and lasting peace, and is willing to exchange the existing cease-fire lines for recognized and secure frontiers, as soon as those frontiers are agreed upon as part of a peace settlement. Until such time, we shall to the best of our ability administer the area on our side of the cease-fire lines, and discharge our responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of all the inhabitants of that area.

II Return to Normal Life

At the end of the fighting and the establishment of the cease-fire lines by the Security Council, Israel unexpectedly found itself in possession of territories containing about a million Arabs. Under conditions of collapsed public services, economic life and local security, an administration had to be improvised over-night, and normal living restored as rapidly as possible. This was accomplished with remarkable speed and success. What helped was that the Israel Army is made up mainly of civilian reservists, and was able to draw on the services of mobilized administrators, engineers, economists and farm experts. In addition, each of the Israel Government Ministries concerned attached its representatives to the Military Governors; day-to-day civilian policy was guided by a committee of Directors-General of Ministries, responsible to a Cabinet Committee.

Insert from p.6.

and damaged

The immediate task was to restore essential services, disrupted/by the war. By September, such public ~~services~~ utilities as water, electricity, santitation and transport were ~~functioning~~ restored, ~~functing normally~~, and shortages of certain food-stuffs such as frësh fruit and vegetables, milk and meat had been remedied from Israel stocks. ~~Exit~~ Attention was then concentrated on ~~restoring~~ reviving business activity, ~~solving the problem of marketingx~~ finding markets for farm surpluses, ~~xndngnxnxrnihynxexixingxornxnxnx naixingxnkoxhnxnhxnnfxexnxnmixnx~~ providing employment through public works ~~projects~~, and generally restoring or even raising the levels of economic activity that had existed before the war. ~~The school systemx, the hospitals~~ Schools, hospitals and public health services ~~have all been operating fully in the Israel-held areas~~ were brought back to normal operation. Due to our diligent efforts, there have been none of the ~~xnhxxpxcpxxxxxcxc~~ ~~widespread~~ hunger, disease or civilian hardship that is ~~thexxxxxxxx~~ usually found in war-torn areas. ~~Thexstrikkic~~

(Arrow on p. 5)

The most striking feature of the Israel administration is that it is small and ~~inconspicuous~~, unobtrusive, and is able to rely fully upon the cooperation of ~~xxxxi~~ Arab local authorities in running the affairs of their own towns and villages. The total staff of the Israel administration for all the areas is only about 200, including clerks, secretaries and drivers. ~~Exxxxxx~~ The Mayors, Councils and village Mukhtars have remained in office, and the great bulk of teachers, policemen and other persons in public service have continued in the same jobs.

~~Naturally, the maintenance of public services, the provision of employment~~ ~~xx public and social services, the provision of employment through works projects, and so forth,~~ (Naturally, these efforts) constitute a financial burden for Israel, but it is one which the Israel tax-payer is willing to shoulder, in discharge of our responsibility ~~yxx xxxxxxxxthe~~ for the civilian populations in the areas concerned. The budgetary allocations for these civilian services ~~purposes from~~ for the nine-month period from June 1967 until the end of the financial year on 31 March 1968 amounted to IL. 150 million, the equivalent of ~~over 40 million U.S. dollars~~ nearly $ (US) 40 million.

The population of the four Israel-held territories is as follows: (in round figures)

The West Bank	600,000
The Gaza Strip	360,000
Northern Sinai	33,000
Golan Heights	6,000

The Sinai desert is virtually uninhabited. In the Golan Heights, the Arab population migrated deeper into Syria during the fighting, and only some Druze villages were left. These Druze were never politically or culturally integrated in Syria; they have joined the Druze community inside Israel, and give rise to no difficulties. More needs to be said about the two territories that have a substantial population, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

The Gaza Strip

In an earlier intervention, my delegation put on record some of the facts about the Gaza Strip. As has already been mentioned, this territory was occupied by Egyptian forces in the 1948 fighting, and remained a kind of neglected colonial appendage. But it was never allowed to become part of Egyptian life and economy, and remained isolated and stagnant. The residents had no political rights, and were ruled by a military boss. The main purpose it served for Egypt was a military one - first as a base for raiding into Israel, and later as a recruiting and training centre for Palestinian brigades of the Egyptian army. When it came under our control in the June war, we found that its economy had rested mainly on large-scale smuggling, the funds spent by UNRWA and their relief agencies, the exploitation of cheap labour by the Egyptian authorities, family remittances from other Arab countries, labour employed by the U.N. Peace Force, which was kicked out shortly before the war, and some citrus growing and fishing. The local water resources had been wastefully used and were close to exhaustion and salinity. Industry was non-existent. Cash deposits in the banks had been removed to Egypt before the fighting started.

The Israel authorities have been making a determined efforts to improve living conditions in the Strip. By the end of the ~~xx~~ budgetary year in March, IL. 35 million had been poured by the Israel government into the ~~Strip~~ territory in loans and subsixidies, to stimulate economic activity and create employment. In addition, purchases by visitors from Israel totalled about IL. 10 million Thousands of workers are ~~x~~ being employed in the repair of roads, bridges and damaged buildings; their minimum wages have been doubled and their hours ~~x~~ of work ~~laid down~~ fixed at eight hours, for the first time. The citrus groves and fishing fleet have been rehabilitated with the help of Israel grants and loans, and in both cases the output is now well above pre-war levels. The total citrus crop has been sold ~~xxxxxxx~~ abroad with the assistance of the Israel Citrus Marketing Board. The health services have been much improved, with the Palestinian doctors and nurses being given facilities for more advanced training, and being taken on visits to Israel health institutions. ~~Plans are about to be put into effect for expanding~~ Trade schools and work-shops are about to be expanded, and ~~providing~~ vocational skills taught ~~for~~ to adult workers. ~~Another important development is that~~ Gaza residents are now able to travel around freely in Israel and the West Bank, or to ~~cross over~~ visit ~~to~~ East Jordan ~~for temporary x visits, or to stay if they wish~~ if they wish. The ~~xxxx~~ ~~xx~~ ghetto walls of Gaza have ~~tumbled~~ come tumbling down for good.

The West Bank

The West Bank area was occupied in 1948 by Jordanian forces, in ~~defiance~~ defiance of United Nations decisions on Palestine. After that Jordan ~~went through the motions of annexation~~ purported to annex it, but ~~xxxxx~~ for ~~19~~ years the West Bank remained in effect an occupied territory, without Jordanian absorption of it being recognized by the outside world, even by other Arab States. The inhabitants never became fully reconciled to being ruled from ~~xxxxx~~ Amman. The history of Jordanian control of the territory before June 1967 was a more disturbed one than its ~~the~~ history under Israel control since then, ~~just to take the most recent~~ for instance, the 18-month period before the war. In January 1966, the Jordanian authorities

arrested 200 persons in Jericho; in April, they arrested 2,000 residents of the West Bank; in May, mass demonstrations against the government took place in Jerusalem, Hebron and Ramallah, and were suppressed by force, with the schools closed down and hundreds of persons jailed. In July, disturbances and mass demonstrations broke out again in Nablus, with tear-gas used by the police, twleve persons injured and 250 arrested. In November and December and January, there were a series of disturbances and clashes in the area, with the Jordanian army repeatedly called upon to suppress demonstrations and enforce curfews, and even, on 8 December, break a general business strike by force. On January 13, 1967, Jordanian military units had to surround Nablus and break their way in through barricades erected by the citizens. By comparison with what went before, the relations between the Israel administration and the local population of the area have been cooperative and free of trouble. This can be confirmed by the hundreds of thousands of Israeli residents, foreign tourists, diplomats, newspaper correspondents and others who travel around the area every day in complete freedom, and comment on the fact that Israel army units or military vehicles are seldom seen.

Economically, the West Bank area was the step-child of Jordan. For internal political reasons, East Jordan was favoured at the expense of West Jordan, which before 1948 had been the more prosperous and developed area of the two. Under Jordan occupation the West Bank had almost half the population, but accounted for only one-third of the output. Economically, the East Bank enjoyed complete priority of investment and development, and all the country's sizable industries were located there. Per capita income in East Jordan was 335 dollars and in the West Bank 216. The West Bank, with almost half the population, was left with 22% of Jordan's industry and 16% of her transport.

Under Israel control, a major effort has been made to revive and develop the economic life on the West Bank. Fifty percent of the population supports itself by farming. In less than a year, agriculture is already beginning to receive a new impetus. A system of production councils have been set up

for specific products. Scientific crop-planning has been introduced and new ~~types~~ of crops such as cotton. Arabic-speaking Israeli instructors have been running special courses and field days for local farmers, more than 8,000 of whom have already received instruction in modern cultivation techniques, irrigation systems, agricultural implements, fertilizers, ~~xxxxxx~~ insecticides and seeding. They are able to visit and learn from the Arab ~~farm~~ villages in Israel, where the farm output has on the average increased six-fold in two decades.

All handicrafts and small local industries ~~xxxx~~ are now working again at full production. In urban and professional occupations, salaries have been increased, family allowances introduced, and office hours and annual leave regulated. There are 7,000 local Arab personnel presently on the salary rolls of the Israel administration on the West Bank including ~~34,000~~ 3,400 teachers and 300 policemen.

Before the war, a great deal of the farm produce of the West Bank was exported to the East Bank, and to Arab countries beyond. This flow of produce was soon resumed with the encouragement of the Israel authorities, and a daily average of more than one hundred loaded trucks ~~loads~~ crossed the Jordan River eastwards, over Bailey bridges constructed jointly by Israel and Jordan army engineers, alongside the bridges destroyed in the fighting. The value of the produce that has crossed ~~the Jordan River eastwards~~ by now is estimated at $15,000,000.

The movement of goods is accompanied by the movement of people. Thousands of persons cross ~~at~~ Allenby Bridge to East Jordan on temporary permits issued to them by the Israel authorities, and come back again after one or more weeks, To quote the Foreign Editor of the London Financial Times: "~~The fact remains that~~ For the first time ever, the Arabs are travelling in large numbers to and fro between Israeli and Arab territory. . . . It is a development arguably more important than any of the other aspects of the Middle East situation . . . Some 30,000 people have already taken advantage of this and presumably they can and do report to the East Bank that they are not being slaughtered by the Israelis, that the West Bank is prospering, that the El Fatah terrorists are making no serious impact on the life of the West Bank."

One might add that the West Bank residents, the Gaza residents, and the Israelis are all travelling around freely to all parts of the total area held by Israel, and this is without doubt having a revolutionary effect on their feelings and attitudes. The Arabs in these territories have different political views about their future, and express them without any inhibitions. But one sentiment they all hold in common - they no longer want war and conflict with Israel, but peace and co-existence with Israel. They have found to their own surprise and resentment that their own leaders and propaganda machines have grossly mislead them. The Israelis with whom they now mingle are neither the murderers and oppressors nor the squirming cowards they have been led to believe, but decent and creative human beings, with whom these Arabs can live in peace and dignity . That is the shattering development to which the Arab Governments and spokesmen cannot reconcile themselves. That is the source of the compulsion which drives the spokesmen of these governments to such a frantic effort to persuade the world that the Israelis are brutal, that they are committing atrocities, that they are trampling on human rights. That compulsion has been much in evidence at this Conference in Teheran.

One form it takes is to promote sneak raids across the cease-fire lines by terrorists and to try and dress up this activity as a resistance movement by the local populations against Israel occupiers. That picture is totally false, because No such resistance movement exists in Israel-held territories. Nor was this kind of border warfare born out of the Six-Day War. We have been accustomed to periods of such terrorist organized terrorism, whenever the Arab countries around us shrank from a direct military confrontation with Israel. One such period was from 1953 to 1956, when the murderous fedayeen raids deep into Israel territory were organized by the Egyptian authorities from the Gaza Strip. That form of armed attack led directly to the Sinai Campaign of October 1956, and the occupation of the Gaza Strip by Israel at that time. For a decade after that the Israel-Egyptian border remained quiet, for the simple reason that raiding by armed terrorists and

and saboteurs was regarded as too dangerous, while Egypt was building up its ~~military~~ strength for a future military showdown with Israel. But a few years later, in the sixties, the same type of operation was launched by the Syrian regime, under the name of ~~"The"~~ People's ~~War~~". As a rule, the terrorist squads, trained and equipped by Syria were sent into Israel across the Jordan and Lebanese borders. For several years these incursions across the border, and Israel's ~~x~~ occasional reaction to them, was the central theme of Security Council debates on the ~~danger~~ tension and danger to peace in the Middle East. I was myself at that time my country's representative to the United Nations, and on a number of occasions presented details of these organized guerilla activities to the Security Council. Every definition of aggression that has ever been suggested at the United Nations includes this type of activity. ~~(Quote Russian definition)~~ I would draw particular attention to a Draft Convention on the definition of aggression submitted some years ago by the USSR in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly: [Quote]

The relevance of that definition to the Middle East is plain. These El Fatah raids are a form of armed aggression by Arab States against Israel. They are open violations of the cease-fire. Israel must take all necessary measures to repel and restrict them. That is also our duty under the United Nations' resolutions which make Israel responsible for the safety and security of the civilian population in Israel-held territory.

Insert from p. 13

One final comment on this ~~type~~ point. ~~With~~ The present El Fatah terrorists, like ~~with~~ their predecessors, in the years before June 1967, or ~~with~~ the ~~Fedy~~ fedayun from the Gaza Strip, maybe lauded as Arab heroes. We regard them as cowardly murderers, who sneak in under cover of darkness to put dynamite under the homes of sleeping farmers' families, ~~or~~ place mines on roads where bus-loads of children can be blown up, or throw hand-grenades into crowded market-places and run away. ~~Exxxxxxthat~~ Our European friends ~~xxxxx~~ have their own recollections of the heroism of the resistance. ~~xxxxxxxxx but there is nothing in common between the two movements~~. Let me quote a resolution adopted by the International Union of Resistance Movements and Deportation Victims, at its conference in Brussels from the 31 March to 2 April, of this year.

~~[illegible]~~ It declares that nobody should be permitted to compare the spirit of the resistance movements with terrorist acts and odious crimes which aim at blindly creating insecurity and fear, and provoking violence, at a time when ~~[illegible]~~ every opportunity is being publicly offered for a genuine discussion of all matters in dispute. The resolution expresses a sense of outrage/and insult at comparing ~~[illegible]~~ Nazism with the ~~courageous~~ defence by the citizens of Israel of their right to exist.

Israel p. 12.

It is also worth mentioning that the border areas where this terrorist activity is most marked are not the areas occupied by Israel in June 1967, but those districts, such as the Beisan Valley and the Negev in the south, that have always been part of the State of Israel.

Religion

One of the most important gains of the Six-Day War is in the field of religious rights and liberties. For 19 years of Jordanian occupation, no single Jew was allowed access to the most sacred ~~[illegible]~~ holy place of our religion, the Western Wall in the Old City, although this was a right expressly guaranteed by the 1949 Armistice Agreement. ~~In general~~, ~~the~~ Jordanian behaviour towards ~~the Jews~~ Jewish rights was barbarous. During the fighting of 1948, the inhabitants of the ancient Jewish quarter of the Old City, and of Jewish villages like the Etzion Bloc near Hebron, were slaughtered or carried off as captives. The Jewish quarter itself was destroyed, and not a single one of its 35 synagogues left intact. The cemetary on the Mount of Olives, where Jews have been buried since times immemorial has been completely desecrated and tens of thousands of tombstones smashed or carted off to be used for buildings, army camps and even latrines. A limited number of Christian Arabs in Israel were allowed to cross to Bethlehem twice a year, but no Arab Moslems from Israel were allowed to go on pilgrimage to Mecca, the Egyptian authorities ~~would not permit from their to go to Mecca~~. also prevented its Moslems in the Gaza Strip from making the pilgrimage.

injustice has been remedied
All this ~~has been completely~~ since the June war. Within weeks of the cease-fire, on 27 June 1967, the Knesset (the Israel Parliament) adopted a law for the protection of all holy and sacred places, and guaranteeing complete freedom of access for the members of every religion to the places sacred to them. For the first time in twenty years there is complete freedom of worship, of access and of pilgrimage for all faiths in the Holy Land.

Refugees

Immediately after the fighting, the Israel Government proposed to UNRWA to continue its work in the areas concerned, and signed an agreement of cooperation with the Agency. As the Commissioner-General, Dr. Michelmore, reported to the last session of the General Assembly, this cooperation has been satisfactory. UNRWA has been given every facility and assistance for continuing its humanitarian task in Israel-held areas.

One of the matters which the Commissioner-General has stressed in his reports has been the substantial movement of persons from the West Bank area to East Jordan and beyond. This was initially a flight ~~from~~ during the fighting, which on the Jordan front lasted only 72 hours. Since then, there has been an orderly and voluntary movement for a variety of reasons - partly family ties; partly economic, because of sources of income in Jordan or remittances from elsewhere in the Arab world; partly psychological, because of uncertainty about the future, ~~and the pressures on West Bank Arabs from Amman not to cooperate with the Israel authorities~~. Of recent months, the movement from West Bank has become negligible, though there is a small-scale movement from the Gaza Strip. The policy of the Israel Government has been that it has no right to keep anyone in Israel-held territory against his will. None of these people have been driven out, as is alleged from Arab sources.

As the Conference is aware, the United Nations resolutions requested the Israel Government to facilitate the return of those who ~~have~~ wished to come back. The Israel Government has been willing to do so, subject to the overall security situation, which does not permit of an uncontrolled mass influx. Last year, my Government proposed

a repatriation scheme, with the cooperation of the International Red Cross. Under this scheme, 21,000 persons were issued with permits to return, but only 14,000 of them actually appeared. The Israel Government then proposed finding and bringing back the other 7,000, but this was not carried out because of Jordanian non-cooperation - in fact Jordanian representatives failed even to show up at a meeting arranged by the Red Cross to discuss the matter. No doubt much larger numbers might have been authorized at that time, if the Jordan Government had not tried to exploit a humanitarian gesture for political and security purposes, and especially by inciting the returnees to obstruct and undermine the Israel administration. Subsequently, the Israel Government again took the initiative in launching another repatriation project based on the re-union of families and hardship cases. This project too was carried out at first with the cooperation of the International Red Cross, until two Red Cross representatives were wounded by Jordanian fire at the Allenby Bridge. The Israel Government is proceeding on its own. Applications for the return of their relatives are made by West Bank families through their own local authorities. The approved names are then broadcast, and every Monday and Thursday morning groups of these returnees appear at the bridge and are permitted to Cross. Indeed, the Allenby Bridge has become one of the busiest and most curious transit points in the region.

My Government and people are sensitive to the humanitarian problems of refugees, and will try to ease them to the extent that the situation allows. Unfortunately the problem of displacement cannot entirely be divorced from the situation which gave rise to it. There is no doubt that in any movement towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the highest priority should be given to these humanitarian questions. As for the 1948 refugees in the area we control, my government will do its best to ensure their welfare and economic integration, pending an overall political settlement, which would include a solution of the refugee problem, in terms of the Security Council resolution of November 22, given peaceful conditions and regional cooperation, we feel confident that this long-standing problem

will also find a constructive solution. The Israel Government is prepared to make its maximum contribution to such a solution. interesting

Israel's treatment of these territories is ~~praised~~ described in an article called "The Israelis as Occupiers" that appeared in the London Daily Telegraph a few days ago, on April 30, from a special correspondent. I shall quote a few extracts from it: . . . "Israel's occupation of conquered territories has, in general, been the most humane and generous in modern history, even more so than the American occupation of Japan after World War II. And this is proving to be very good practical politics. . . .

Failure of the Al Fatah guerrilla movement, based in Jordan, to achieve any major results in Israeli-occupied territory, is also significant. The fantastically absurd claims of Fatah "victories" broadcast from Arab capitals are a sorry joke among the Arabs under Israel. To date, the men who swagger around Amman terrorising the merchants for cash hand-outs have achieved no major military advantage. They have failed to establish guerrilla bases on the West Bank.

Economic conditions for Arabs in the occupied territories are improving. Many of them, even the professional refugees, are better of than they have ever been before. . . .

War Weariness

Arab wages are rising to a level set by Israeli trade unions. Administration of Arab affairs is still handled by the same mayors and officials who were there before the June war. Most of them admit in private conversation that they have more freedom of movement and expression today than they had under King Hussein's rule. . . .

On its record so far Israel can have a clear conscience before the United Nations or any other international bar on its handling of the occupied Arab territories."

There are some delegates here who have recently been to Israel and can confirm the validity of the "Daily Telegraph" account. All other delegates at this Conference, including the Arab delegates, are welcome to come and see for themselves the situation on the ground. I would not suggest that they

P.T.O.

problems in combating terrorism,
are no security difficulties, or that all
the Arab population is contented, Post-war
be or even that it wishes to remain indefinitely
under Israel control. But, having regard
to all the circumstances, the degree of
normalcy, and peaceful cooperation
is astonishing, and a genuine tribute
to the Israeli Army and
humane and positive character of the
Israel administration. For us, this
is for us not only a matter of
principle but also one of enlightened
self-interest. Oppression and
ill-treatment would be self-defeating,
for it would only increase the
Arab hostility against Israel. We
wish to demonstrate despite the history of conflict, that Jew and
Arab can live together in amity
in the region we share. That
lesson is being learnt between
the 2½ million Jews and ½
million Arabs in the Israel-administered
area, and that is the
most hopeful augury for a better
future. Whatever may be our faults and
mistakes, it is false and
unwarranted to look of Israel's violation of
or disregard for human rights, as the draft
resolution in document 4.19 tries to do.

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise. Good people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

Israel's delegate Chaim Herzog lashed out at resolution characterizing
terror against Israeli civilians as "just means employed by oppressed
peoples", adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Geneva. "This
Conference should have allowed it [terror] to carry out its dirty deed, before
voting on biased resolution, if it has guilt and destruction that therefore we,
also, may have been compelled to vote on such a resolution," he said.
Israel regards every violation of civilians and innocent by any terrorist
whom or all countries and Israel maintains normal relations.
Virtually every important and important delegation received in Iran the
resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means
disgust, as many delegations are reacting to vote against any resolution but
condemn Iran in full. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel
than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution.
Israel will go on standing ready to ill people under the control of the
hand of its enemies."

[illegible]:

In of other countries about two United Nations resolutions in which
Israel played in door - Security Council meeting and U.N. conference on Race
Racism in Geneva. Pattern emerging from elsewhere in U.N. This and later
resolution that some decades ago, in conjunction or cooperation with the
Arabs by some Third World countries or Organization of African Unity
country under a Socialist, called the Organization of Arab
Palestine-Communist [illegible] Third World alliance and with bulk of
anti-Western, [illegible] Third World alliance and with bulk of
Organization of African Unity, Israel was a special target of
which received of foreign guerrillas. Good people of the world [illegible]
[illegible] from organizations' own operation, but since then the latter have
contained to murder, loot, burn in territories they can control.

In Vienna, representatives of 35 nations voted on San Pietro [illegible] though
above were accepted literally at face value to resolution. Large number of
the nations represented in Vienna [illegible] were duly [illegible] above the
version; but they did not attempt to [illegible] vote was did not wish to commit
themselves only five nations refrained on [illegible]. The resolution avoided
Israel by name, although it [illegible] with [illegible]

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan — which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia — until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise. Good people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan — which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia — until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise. Good people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan — which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia — until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise, @ood people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan — which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia — until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise. Good people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan — which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia — until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

JERUSALEM POST 9:5:68

NEWS ITEM:

Israel's delegate Michael Comay lashed out at resolution "expressing grave concern at Israeli violations of Arab human rights" in occupied territories, adopted at U.N. Human Rights Conference in Teheran. "This Conference should have allowed U Thant to carry out his inquiry first, before voting on biased resolution that has split and destroyed this Conference, which has never been competent to vote on such a resolution," he said. "Israel regards draft resolution of Netherlands and Uruguay as being true voice of all countries with which Israel maintains normal friendly relations." Virtually every impartial and uncommitted delegation refused to back the resolution, voted against, or abstained and abstention on this vote means dissent, as many delegations are hesitant to vote against any resolution that concerns human rights. Views of these countries will mean more to Israel than counting of votes. "My country will pay no respect to this resolution. Israel will go on discharging duties to all people under its control to the best of its abilities."

EDITORIAL:

Air of utter unreality about two United Nations proceedings in which Israel placed in dock - Security Council meeting and U.N. Conference on Human Rights in Teheran. Picture emerging from speeches in New York and Teheran is roughly that some decades ago, a collection of vagabonds from different parts of the world known as Jews banded together, infiltrated into the country known as Southern Syria, robbed the indigenous population of lands, setting up a parasitical entity known as Jewish State and with the help of fellow-conspirators throughout the world started planning conquest of surrounding areas. Last June time seemed ripe and the interlopers launched operation of conquest, pillage, rape and murder against innocent dwellers of what remained of Syrian paradise. Good people of the world prevented the Jewish pirates from completing the operation, but since then the latter have continued to murder, loot, destroy in territories they did conquer.

In Teheran, representatives of 42 nations voted on resolution as though above were accurate history of background to resolution. Large number of the nations abstained as though they felt there might be some doubt about the version, but they were not altogether sure and did not wish to commit themselves; only five nations rejected it outright. The resolution ordered Israel to treat citizens of West Bank "in accordance with international

conventions on Human Rights" and situation of improper treatment that was rightly rejected by Israel's chief delegate Mr. Michael Comay. Three countries offered resolution based on new version of history. One is Sudan -- which according to information recently published by U.N. has, since 1963 massacred half-a-million of its non-Moslem non-Arab inhabitants and driven another half-million into the bush to die of starvation and disease. Another is Saudi Arabia -- until recently at least, engaged in a flourishing slave trade, a country which bars Jews from service with foreign companies operating there or foreign military units visiting there. A third country is Spain, in which the slightest move towards religious and civil liberty is still considered a world event. These countries were supported generously by the Soviet Union. The toll of blood which that country has taken from its own citizens and citizens of other countries in the march of conquest over own people and neighbours is too well known to need recounting. The situation is only a little more rational at the Security Council. There, however, real-politik plays more important role than in Human Rights Commission and more important role than truth or falsehood of issue raised. Resolution adopted there as a result may overlook important and fasten onto trivial matters but they are less grotesque.

- - - - - - -

לשלוח: —

Chosan 157 | KAAT | מספר הטלגרמה

9/5/68

LEHALAN BA POST MEHAYOM AL VEIDAT TEHERAN(YEDIA UMAAMAR):

NEWS ITEM: ISRAELS DELEGATE MICHAEL COMAY LASHED OUT AT RESOLUTION "EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN AT ISRAELI VIOLATIONS OF ARAB HUMAN RIGHTS" IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES,ADOPTED AT UN HUMAN RIGHTS CONFERENCE IN TEHERAN. "THIS CONFERENCE SHOULD HAVE ALLOWED U THANT TO CARRY OUT HIS INQUIRY FIRST, BEFORE VOTING ON BIASED RESOLUTION THAT HAS SPLIT AND DESTROYED THIS CONFERENCE, WHICH HAS NEVER BEEN COMPETENT TO VOTE ON SUCH A RESOLUTION" HE SAID. " ISRAEL REGGARDS DRAFT RESOLUTION OF NETHERLANDS AND URUGUAY AS BEING TRUE VOICE OF ALL COUNTRIES WITH WHICH ISRAEL MAINTAINS NORMAL FRIENDLY RELATIONS;" VIRTUALLY EVERY IMPARTIAL AND UNCOMMITTED DELEGATION REFUSED TO BACK RESOLUTION, VOTED AGAINST, OR ABSTAINED AND ABSTENTION ON THIS VOTE MEANS DISSENT, AS MANY DELEGATIONS ARE HESITANT TO VOTE AGAINST ANY RESOLUTION THAT CONCERNS HUMAN RIGHTS. VIEWS OF THESE COUNTRIES WILL MEAN MORE TO ISRAEL THAN COUNTING OF VOTES. " MY COUNTRY WILL PAY NO RESPECT TO THIS RESOLUTION. ISRAEL WILL GO ON DISCHARGING DUTIES TO ALL PEOPLE UNDER ITS CONTROL TO BEST OF ABILITIES".

EDITORIAL: AIR OF UTTER UNREALITY ABOUT TWO UNITED NATIONS PROCEEDINGS IN WHICH ISRAEL PLACED IN DOCK-SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING AND UN CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN TEHERAN. PICTURE EMERGING FROM SPEECHES IN NEW YORK AND TEHERAN IS ROUGHLY THAT SOME DECADES AGO, A COLLECTION OF VAGABONDS FROM DIFFERENT PARTS OF WORLD KNOWN AS JEWS BANDED TOGETHER INFILTRATED INTO COUNTRY KNOWN AS SOUTHERN SYRIA ROBBED INDIGENOUS POPULATION OF LANDES, SETTING UP A PARASITICAL ENTITY KNOWN AS JEWISH STATE AND WITH HELP OF FELLOW CONSPIRATORS THROUGHOUT WORLD STARTED PLANNING CONQUEST OF SURROUNDING AREAS. LAST JUNE TIME SEEMED RIPE AND INTERLOPERS LAUNCHED OPERATION OF CONQUEST, PILLAGE, RAPE AND MURDER AGAINST INNOCENT DWELLERS OF WHAT REMAINED OF SYRIAN PARADISE. GOOD PEOPLE OF WORLD PREVENTED THE JEWISH PIRATES FROM COMPLETING OPERATION, BUT SINCE THEN LATTER HAVE CONTINUED TO MURDER, LOOT DESTROY IN TERRITORIES THEY DID CONQUER. IN TEHERAN, REPRESENTATIVES OF 42 NATIONS VOTED ON RESOLUTION AS THOUGH ABOVE WERE ACCURATE HISTORY OF BACKGROUND TO RESOLUTION. LARGE NUMBER OF NATIONS ABSTAINED AS THOUGH THEY FELT THERE MIGHT BE SOME DOUBT ABOUT VERSION, BUT THEY WERE NOT ALTOGETHER SURE AND DID NOT WISH TO COMMIT THEMSELVES, ONLY FIVE NATIONS REJECTED IT OUTRIGHT. RESOLUTION ORDERED ISRAEL TO TREAT CITIZENS OF WEST BANK " IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS" AND SITUATION OF IMPROPER TREATMENT THAT WAS RIGHTLY REJECTED BY ISRAELS CHIEFDELEGATE Mr. MICHAEL COMAY.THREE COUNTRIES OFFERED RESOLUTION BASED ON NEW VERSION OF HISTORY. ONE IS SUDAN — WICH ACCORDING TO INFORMATION RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY UN HAS, SINCE 1963 MASSACRED HALF A MILLION OF ITS NON MOSLEM NO ARAB INHABITANTS AND DRIVEN ANOTHER HALF MILLION INTO BUSH TO DIE OF STARVATION AND DISEASE. ANOTHER IS SAUDI ARABIA — UNTIL RECENTLY AT LEAST, ENGAGED IN

FLOURISHING SLAVE TRADE, COUNTRY WHICH BARS JEWS FROM SERVICE WITH FOREIGN [illegible]/
COMPANIES OPERATING THERE OR FOREIGN MILITARY UNITS VISITING THERE. THIRD COUNTRY IS
SPAINE IN WHICH SLIGHTEST MOVE TOWARDS RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL LIBERTY IS STILL CONSIDERED
WORLD EVENT. THESE COUNTRIES WERE SUPPORTED GENEROUSLY BY SOVIET UNION. TOLL OF BLOOD
WHICH THAT COUNTRY HAS TAKEN FROM OWN CITIZENS AND CITIZENS OF OTHER COUNTRIES IN
MARCH OF CONQUEST OVER OWN PEOPLE AND NEIGHBOURS IS TOO WELL KNOWN TO NEED RECOUNTING.
SITUATION IS ONLY LITTLE MORE RATIONAL AT SECURITY COUNCIL. THERE HOWEVER, REALPOLITIK
PLAYS MORE IMPORTANT ROLE THAN IN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND MOREIMPORTANT ROLE THAN
TRUTH OR FALSEHOOD OF ISSUE RAISED. RESOLUTION ADOPTED THERE AS RESULT MAY OVERLOOK
IMPORTANT AND [illegible] ONTO TRIVIAL, BUT THEY ARE LESS GROTESQUE.

International Conference
on Human Rights

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
Chairman of the Delegation of Israel
in the Plenary

In Explanation of Vote on Item 12
Tuesday, 7 May 1968.

Madame President,

My delegation voted against Draft Resolution L. 19, and in favour of Draft Resolution L. 20.

Now that draft resolution L. 19 has been carried, I would put briefly on the record of the Conference how my Government will regard it. This is only appropriate since the resolution purports to be directed at Israel.

We have noted with care the pattern of the voting connected with it. The support for it was drawn mainly from the Arab and Soviet groups, and other delegations who, with very few exceptions, were already committed to the Arab side of the Israel-Arab conflict. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of impartial and uncommitted delegations refused to support it and registered their dissent by negative votes or abstentions. It is clear from the debate and from the explanations of vote, that abstention in this case constitutes dissent. It is recognized that many delegations hesitate to vote against any proposal concerning human rights, even if they disagree with the substance of the proposal.

The resolution as adopted is dubious, controversial, polemical and slanted. It is beyond the competence of the Conference. It is based on no worthwhile evidence, and pre-judges the enquiry on which the Secretary-General of the United Nations is about to embark. It has split this Conference and had a destructive impact upon its work and standing. It

could not possibly bring about any useful or constructive purpose. My Government will not pay it respect or any serious attention. We shall go on discharging to the best of our ability the responsibilities we carry for the safety, welfare and security of the population under our control; and we shall account for our administration at the proper time and place.

On the other hand, the draft resolution submitted by the Delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay was voted down by Arab and Soviet opposition. My delegation, nevertheless, regards it as the authentic voice of this Conference on the item under discussion. And the sponsors are to be commended for having offered reasonable opinion in this Conference a reasonable alternative to support. My delegation is gratified at the strength shown by that reasonable opinion, both in the debate and in the voting, and wishes to express its appreciation to the commonsense and fairness of the countries concerned, with all of which my country maintains normal and friendly relations. Their position in this matter will weigh far more with my Government than the formal counting of votes.

- - - - - -

International Conference on Human Rights

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay, Chairman of the Israel Delegation, in Plenary

In Explanation of Vote on Item 12

7th May, 1968

Draft Resolutions L.19, 20, 21

Madame President,

My delegation voted against Draft Resolution L.19, and in favor of Draft Resolution L.20.

Now that draft resolution L.19 has been carried, I would put briefly on the record of the conference how my government will regard it. This is only appropriate since the resolution purports to be directed at Israel.

We have noted with care the pattern of the voting connected with it. The support for it was drawn mainly from the Arab and Soviet groups, and other delegations who with very few exceptions were already committed to the Arab side of the Israel-Arab conflict. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of impartial and un-committed delegations refused to support it and registered their dissent by negative votes or abstentions. It is clear from the debate and from the explanations of vote, that abstention in this case constitutes dissent. It is recognised that many delegations hesitate to vote against any proposal concerning human rights, even if they disagree with the substance of the proposal.

The resolution as adopted is dubious, controversial, polemical and slanted. It is beyond the competence of the Conference. It is based on no worthwhile evidence, and pre-judges the enquiry on which the Secretary General of the United Nations is about to embark. It has split this Conference and had a distructive impact upon its work and standing. It could not possibly bring about any useful or constructive purpose. My government will not pay it respect or any serious attention. We shall go on discharging to the best of our ability the responsibilities we carry for the safety, welfare and security of the population under our control; and we shall account for our administration at the proper time and place.

On the other hand, the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay was voted down by Arab and Soviet opposition. My delegation, nevertheless, regards it as the authentic voice of this conference on the item under discussion. And the sponsors are to be commended for having offered a reasonable opinion in this conference and a reasonable alternative to support. My delegation is gratified at the strength shown by that reasonable opinion, both in the debate and in the voting, and wishes to express its appreciation to the common sense and fairness of ~~nearly all those countries with which~~ the countries concerned with all of which my country maintains normal and friendly relations. Their position in this matter will weigh far more with my government than the formal counting of votes.

International Conference
on Human Rights

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
Chairman of the delegation of Israel
in the Plenary

In Explanation of Vote on Item 12
Tuesday, 7 May 1968.

Madame President,

My delegation voted against Draft Resolution L. 19, and in favour of Draft Resolution L. 20.

Now that draft resolution L. 19 has been carried, I would put briefly on the record of the Conference how my Government will regard it. This is only appropriate since the resolution purports to be directed at Israel.

We have noted with care the pattern of the voting connected with it. The support for it was drawn mainly from the Arab and Soviet groups, and other delegations who, with very few exceptions, were already committed to the Arab side of the Israel-Arab conflict. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of impartial and uncommitted delegations refused to support it and registered their dissent by negative votes or abstentions. It is clear from the debate and from the explanations of vote, that abstention in this case constitutes dissent. It is recognized that many delegations hesitate to vote against any proposal concerning human rights, even if they disagree with the substance of the proposal.

The resolution as adopted is dubious, controversial, polemical and slanted. It is beyond the competence of the Conference. It is based on no worthwhile evidence, and pre-judges the enquiry on which the Secretary-General of the United Nations is about to embark. It has split this Conference and had a destructive impact upon its work and standing. It

could not possibly bring about any useful or constructive purpose. My Government will not pay it respect or any serious attention. We shall go on discharging to the best of our ability the responsibilities we carry for the safety, welfare and security of the population under our control; and we shall account for our administration at the proper time and place.

On the other hand, the draft resolution submitted by the Delegations of the Netherlands and Uruguay was voted down by Arab and Soviet opposition. My delegation, nevertheless, regards it as the authentic voice of this Conference on the item under discussion. And the sponsors are to be commended for having offered reasonable opinion in this Conference a reasonable alternative to support. My delegation is gratified at the strength shown by that reasonable opinion, both in the debate and in the voting, and wishes to express its appreciation to the commonsense and fairness of the countries concerned, with all of which my country maintains normal and friendly relations. Their position in this matter will weigh far more with my Government than the formal counting of votes.

- - - - - -

International Conference
On Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf. 32/L. 18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery. "

- - - - - - -

International Conference
On Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf. 32/L. 18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery. "

- - - - - - -

International Conference
On Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf. 32/L. 18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery. "

- - - - - - -

International Conference
On Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf. 32/L. 18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery. "

- - - - - - -

International Conference
on Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf.32/L.18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery."

- - - - -

International Conference
on Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf.32/L.18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery."

- - - - -

International Conference
on Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel to the draft declaration submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/Conf.32/L.18/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph on page 3 as follows :

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of minorities and distinctive groups," after the words "suppression of democratic rights and freedoms,"

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "incitement to war," after the words "racial discrimination,"

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "neo-fascism", and add thereafter the words "the revival of anti-Semitism, and the persistence of slavery."

- - - - -

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Amendments proposed by the Yugoslav delegation to Article 1 of the draft Declaration submitted by the Drafting Committee of the Commission on Human Rights

E/CN.4/AC.1/L.6/Rev. 1

Amend the second paragraph to read as follows:

(a) In the second line of the paragraph, insert the words "including those of economic and political groups," after the word "organizations";

(b) In the third line of the paragraph, insert the words "including slavery," after the words "social discrimination";

(c) In the fourth line of the paragraph, place a comma after the word "non-freedom", and thereafter the words "the revival of anti-semitism, and the glorification of slavery".

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

Geneva Report of 1955 follows
by Supplt. Convention 1956

Saudi Arabia 120-121

estimated 250,000

detailed, gruesome description of
Slave trade

Affairs on Anti-Slavery Society (see Award para 25 p. 10)

Psychological effect of questionnaires
p. 7.

Yemen - claim of ~~free~~
emancipation of Slave pop.
~~after revolution~~ by 1964
Constitution (p. 8)

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

1933 ~~Leag~~ League Advisory Committee of Experts on Slavery, under Lord Lugard as Chairman

13 May, 1949, ECOSOC requested to study problem of Slavery —

Slavery Ad Hoc ~~expert~~ Committee on ~~reports~~ (4 experts) appointed by Ecosoc

submitted reports

League of Nations Slavery Convention of 1926

Supplem Convention on Slavery of 1956

- Creation of international Supervision ~~division~~ machinery

Conference. — ₱. 310.

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES
سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

Mr Lewis
14/5/76

Draft Resolution L.30

My delegation regretted that we had not been given an adequate opportunity to consider this draft resolution properly ~~from~~, to consult on it, ~~and~~ or to study the relevant facts, or to get instructions on it. ~~We would not be ready to~~ We could for it as an ~~expression~~ ~~of~~ expression of

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

~~Basic~~ Basic our a bien

~~to principle~~ that

no discrimination

on the ground of

race or colour should

be ~~prohibited~~ permissible in the

field of sport, or

in any other field of

human activity.

Typed out by RC

15/5/68 for our

records

Comments on Draft Resolution L.19 & L.20

Madame President! My delegation will confine itself to the resolutions and amendments before us. In ~~my~~ delegation's ~~statement~~ on this item on Tues (15), we made some initial comments on the ~~text~~ of resolution in doc. L.19,

Preamble: ~~L.19~~ L.19 ~~Preamble~~

① It misquotes ~~resolutions~~ relevant resolutions of S.C. & G.A.'s ~~Those resolutions~~ It ~~is~~ conceals that those resolutions deal with civilians in the whole area of the conflict, including the Arab States; and it pretends that the resolutions apply only to Israel

(b) It tries to sneak in by the backdoor the question of the status of Jerusalem

(c) It refers to a telegram from the Human Rights Commission, but conceals the fact, ~~that~~ the stated in the telegram itself, that the Commission was basing itself purely on a newspaper report, & not on any independent enquiry from any source at all. I shall come back to this point in dealing with the amendments ~~in~~ proposed in Doc. L.21

boring to operative part,

Op. paras I and 2 —

very obvious violation of every accepted canon of judicial fairness, and every possible concept of United Nations responsibilities. What is more, it is an outright repudiation of the S.G. himself. Once more, it must be noted.

(a) That it is the S.G.'s express job to report to the S.C. & G.A. on these matters;

(b) That the S.G. has had

allegations & concerns conveyed to him

(c) that the SG is not in a position to deal with the matter, as he is not in possession of the relevant facts.

(d) that he ~~is proper~~ therefore proposes to send a special representation to the area on a fact-finding mission crucial to the matter.

The SG is fact-finding ~~mission~~ mission, which is crucial to the matter, does not even rate a mention in the text.

What is this conference now being asked to do?

It is being asked to pronounce

Judgment on violations & or disregard of human rights without having the evidence before it. That is making a mockery of these proceedings, and would not enhance the prestige of the conference. My government could certainly not regard such a judgment as ~~to~~ or as having any valid, ~~or~~ ~~or~~ ~~character~~ ~~to~~ ~~has~~ any moral value.

Amendments in Doc. L. 21

Amendments re Doc. L.21

Amendments (2) + (3) would throw aside altogether the relevant Security Council + G.A. resolutions, and the basis of the ~~Report~~ deal with the Cuellar Explanations in the whole area of Conflict; and ~~that makes the~~ U.N. responsible for following and reporting on the matter.

These amendments try to do two things:

(a) to limit the scope of United Nations concern only to Israel-held territories, and to

withdraw HRX concern from the rest of the area of ~~conflict~~ the H.R. conflict

(b) Take the task of following & reporting on these humanitarian concerns out of the hands of the S.G., and to create instead a new special committee. That is a startling vote of no confidence in ~~the Secretary-General~~ the U Thant ~~Account~~. The question of competency is ~~one~~ made even more complicated and confused & by proposing that the

Human Rights Commission must keep the matter under constant review. In other words, the Sec.-Gen must deal with this matter & report to the S.C. / Gen. Assembly; a Special committee must investigate & report to whom? To the same General Assembly that has requested the S.G. to keep it informed? Will the Special Committee send its rival representatives to the area to draw up its own competing reports? And how is

the Human Rights Commission ~~to~~ discharge the functions now being offered to it. Is the Commission going to send a Board of investigators to the area? Or is the Human Right Commission to go on doing ~~what~~ it has already done once — to ~~send~~ despatch telegrams on the basis of newspaper reports it has read in New York? ~~We are on the~~ We are landing in an area of utter confusion, & creating a welter of competencies [~~daily~~ daily] cutting across

each other. The inevitable conclusion is that these proposals are not serious; they are not designed to fill a gap in the U.N. machinery; but are purely pegs put forward for polemical purposes.

The distinguished rep. of Ceylon suggested, if I understood him correctly, that the object of the amendments was to ensure a proper investigation. I have already shown that that would be superfluous and duplication.

But it is fair to ask him whether he really wishes first to deliver a judgment, as is done in paras 1 & (2), & then to ask for the facts to be investigated? This is the kind of topsy-turvy procedure it is hard to encounter outside the pages of Alice-in-Wonderland.

~~Now what about the first~~ ~~a proposed amendment.~~

My delegation's sense of perplexity was increased by another circumstance. Without

prejudice ~~of~~ our views about the Compétence of the Conference, we felt ~~yesterday~~ ~~Tonight~~ that ~~a~~ out of respect for the Conference, we should give it ~~some~~ a factual review of our administration of these territories. They were being discussed ~~anyway~~ anyway, & we thought it wrong that they should be discussed only in polemical terms. I am sorry we took up so much time in talking about agriculture, employment, health services, freedom of movement, access to holy places, and so forth. But how else can we give a realistic picture of

daily
What a life is really like in
the territories for which we
are responsible, and whether
human rights are really being
trampled upon, as has been so
often and so vehemently declared
from this rostrum. Yet somehow
our account of our stewardship
has been
called a waste of the Conference's
time. Is this conference really not
interested in the facts at all?
My delegation has not asked
the Conference to believe our account.
We do ask it to refuse to
believe any account unless and

until the machinery specially set up to check the facts has too even had an opportunity of functioning. I would repeat that Israel has already undertaken to cooperate with the SG's representative, & thereby to submit our records to international scrutiny. The future of these territories will be settled at the conference table. Meanwhile, we shall continue to discharge to the best of our ability our responsibility for the safety, welfare and security of the civilian population

But we claim the elementary right ~~to~~ do ~~so~~ so in an organised and authorised way, through the proper channels and under the proper circumstances of verification. We could not respect any pre-judgments that may be passed through this Conference in a heated atmosphere, and without any on-the-spot inquiry at all.

(16)

I have little to say about the first proposed amendment. The dest rep. of Sweden has already revealed that this is only part of a resolution of the Human Rights Commission, on which his del the Swedish member abstained. The part that has been carefully deleted is that the Commission was acting only on the basis

of a newspaper report..
Is the Conference now going ~~to endorse~~ blindly
~~to endorse~~ adopt that
resolution as its own? ~~It has~~
~~no~~ The Conference has
not even been furnished with ~~studied~~ the
~~Official~~ record of the
discussion in the
Commission, ~~it do~~ nor has
it any official knowledge
of the materials and facts data which
may or may not
have been before the
Commission. This

Conference is not
Rearfore in a position
to ~~form judgment~~ o
form an opinion whether
the opinion of the
Commission was soundly
based or not. ϕ
My delegation suggests that
this amendment is
wholly out of place
here, and should be
rejected.

~~On the resolution~~

On the draft resolution contained in Doc. L. 20, my delegation would endorse what has already been said by the sponsors, and by the distinguished representatives of Sweden, France, Madagascar and others.

Here again, one feels perplexed. The Arab delegations themselves proposed an agenda item

Which nowhere refers to the Middle East or any local situation, but is worded in universal terms. Whether this was done for tactical & parliamentary reasons or not, it is a self-evident fact. Yet when two very respected delegations take the item seriously, and propose a study and clarification of the subject, they are

accused of drawing a red herring across the ~~work~~ ~~legitimate~~ proper work of the Conference. That is a ~~accusation~~ strange charge ~~to the~~ ~~circumstances~~, and ~~often it~~ against two conscientious delegations that have wish to make a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and the fulfilment of its agenda.

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES
سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

Madam President,

~~My~~ spiteful ~~delegation~~ many ~~abusive~~ and provocative things have been said about my country yesterday and today ~~and this morning~~.

Out of defiance of the ignorance and the pressure upon its time, my delegation will refrain from replying to such allegations. That does not mean

however, that we regard them as having any factual or moral basis. We did not seek these polemical discussions in the first case, and repeatedly urged that they should be avoided. It became clear however that Arab delegations were determined to convert the conference into a private forum for pursuing political warfare against Israel.

the Arab League

It is not a matter for surprise that the initial group of non-Arab delegations, designated to sponsor the resolution, melted away, with the sole exception of the delegation of Spain. It is not for me to surmise what the reasons are for such touching fidelity on the part of one Western state.

IRANIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

سازمان ایرانی مجامع بین‌المللی

But the harmful polemical
~~harmful~~ exercise has
gone far enough.
~~And~~ My delegation
will revert to its
policy of self-restraint
under attack. All
we would ~~like~~
urge once again is that
this conference should
not try to usurp
the functions exercised
by the United Nations
organs concerned, and
not make (form) opinions in advance
of the evidence.

Such a course can only put the Conference itself in a dubious light.

I would end on the hopeful note that peace and cooperation will return to our troubled region, and that all its inhabitants, of every race and faith, will be able to live ~~in free from fear and~~ decent and creative lives, free from fear and want.

~~If all the states~~ ~~are devoted~~ in the

Teheran Conference

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay

on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning of this Conference, my delegation has steadily urged that it should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. The statement just made by the representative of the U.A.R. confirms that foreboding. It would not be a difficult matter for my delegation to prove the falsity of his charges. But we feel that the affairs of the Middle East have by now been sufficiently ventilated at the Conference, and everyone concerned has had his say. What useful purpose could be served by projecting these disputed questions into the last week of the Conference - especially when the appropriate U.N. bodies are dealing with them anyway?

A number of delegations obviously share our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguished representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill and peace that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, ~~(also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083)~~ (also issued as a Conference document A/Conf.32/29 4 May 1968). It is headed

"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (E.S. V)"

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In these Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources.

The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up to date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing, ~~with the concurrence of the Israel Government~~, went

to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967)."

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

Insert

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General

has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put x into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter.

In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, my delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the U.A.R., apart from a general disclaimer.

What we propose in x effect is a cease-fire. The Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in general terms as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. If Arab colleagues reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursing their political offensive, my delegation must reserve the right ~~to explain matters~~ to make a full statement explaining matters, as we see them. That would include dealing fully with the allegations made by the representative of the U.A.R. We still hope that necessity will not arise.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a cease-fire, and we have tried to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.

Amb. Comay
Item 12

6 May/68

Insert page 14, after 1st para. under Refugees

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

Amb. Comay
Item 12

Insert page 14, after 1st para. under Refugees

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

Amb. Comay
Item 12

Insert page 14, after 1st para. under Refugees

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

Amb. Comay
Item 12

Insert page 14, after 1st para. under Refugees

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

International Conference
on Human Rights

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay,
Chairman of the Israel Delegation
Agenda Item 12
6 May 1968.

Insert page 14 , after 1st para.
under heading "Refugees"

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our Education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

- - - - - - - -

Statement by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson
Chairman of the Israel Delegation
Agenda Item 12
5 May 1958

Report Page 14 , after 1:4 para.
Under heading "Refugees"

Teheran Conference

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay

on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning of this Conference, my delegation has steadily urged that it should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. The statement just made by the representative of the U.A.R. confirms that foreboding. It would not be a difficult matter for my delegation to prove the falsity of his charges. But we feel that the affairs of the Middle East have by now been sufficiently ventilated at the Conference, and everyone concerned has had his say. What useful purpose could be served by projecting these disputed questions into the last week of the Conference - especially when the appropriate U.N. bodies are dealing with them anyway?

A number of delegations obviously share our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distingui representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill and peace that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083). It is headed

"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (E.S. V)"

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In those Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources.

The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, upt to date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing, ~~with the concurrence of the Israel Government~~, went

to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967)."

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

Insert

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General

has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put ~~x~~ into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter.

In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, my delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the U.A.R., apart from a general disclaimer.

What we propose in ~~x~~ effect is a cease-fire. The Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in general terms as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. If Arab colleagues reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursing their political offensive, my delegation must reserve the right ~~to explain matters~~ to make a full statement explaining matters as we see them. That would include dealing fully with the allegations made by the representative of the U.A.R. We still hope that necessity will not arise.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a cease-fire, and we have tried to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.

Teheran Conference

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning of this Conference, my delegation has steadily urged that it should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. The statement just made by the representative of the U.A.R. confirms that foreboding. It would not be a difficult matter for my delegation to prove the falsity of his charges. But we feel that the affairs of the Middle East have by now been sufficiently ventilated at the Conference, and everyone concerned has had his say. What useful purpose could be served by projecting these disputed questions into the last week of the Conference - especially when the appropriate U.N. bodies are dealing with them anyway?

A number of delegations obviously share our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguish representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill and peace that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

Item 12

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083). It is headed

"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (E.S. V)"

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In these Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources.

The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up to date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing, ~~with the concurrence of the Israel Government~~, went

to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967).

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

Insert

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General

has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put x into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter.

In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, my delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the U.A.R., apart from a general disclaimer.

What we propose in x effect is a cease-fire. The Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in general terms as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. If Arab colleagues reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursing their political offensive, my delegation must reserve the right to make a full statement explaining matters ~~to explain matters~~ as we see them. That would include dealing fully with the allegations made by the representative of the U.A.R. We still hope that necessity will not arise.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a cease-fire, and we have tried to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.

Teheran Conference

Item 12

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay

on 6 May, 1968

Mr. President,

From the beginning of this Conference, my delegation has steadily urged that it should avoid being dragged into the Arab-Israel conflict. We warned that this course would only divert the time, attention and energy of the Conference, lower its prestige and harm its interests. Nearly two weeks ago, on Thursday 25 April, my delegation declared that it would refrain from replying to Arab attacks on Israel, to the extent possible. Since then we have not asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply to any Arab statement, although the chorus of anti-Israel propaganda continued.

Again, we deplored the inscription of a special item on the agenda, as it would inevitably lead to all the same allegations being repeated at even greater length and vehemence. The statement just made by the representative of the U.A.R. confirms that foreboding. It would not be a difficult matter for my delegation to prove the falsity of his charges. But we feel that the affairs of the Middle East have by now been sufficiently ventilated at the Conference, and everyone concerned has had his say. What useful purpose could be served by projecting these disputed questions into the last week of the Conference - especially when the appropriate U.N. bodies are dealing with them anyway?

A number of delegations obviously share our concern, and have expressed their view that the item before us should be dealt with in general terms, and in relation to broad principles, rather than in relation to any specific conflict or local situation. My delegation was particularly moved by the words of the distinguished representative of Madagascar, last Thursday. His plea for tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbours is in the spirit of international goodwill and peace that marks his own country's policies, and struck a sympathetic chord with us.

In considering the approach to the debate on this item, and to any proposals that may be submitted, one must also bear in mind the absence of any objective and up-to-date study of the facts. This Conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions. The document published by the Secretary-General in this regard is most significant. I refer to Security Council document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, (also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083). It is headed

"Note by the Secretary-General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (E.S. V)"

In paragraph 2, the Secretary-General says that "concern about humanitarian questions in the Middle Eastern area is frequently brought to my attention. However, since the termination of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Nils Gussing . . . there has been no United Nations source of first-hand information on these problems." In view of this, the Secretary-General addressed Notes on 26th and 28th February 1968 on similar lines to the governments of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. In those Notes, the Secretary-General refers to the Security Council and General Assembly "humanitarian" resolutions and states:

"Within the context of the above-mentioned resolutions, allegations have been made and concerns have been expressed in various forms and at various times about the treatment being accorded civilians . . . The Secretary-General, however, at present finds himself in no position to dissipate such concerns effectively by positive reporting of his own based upon information from United Nations sources.

The Secretary-General believes that it would be both useful for the United Nations and in the interest of all the parties concerned to have a first hand, up to date United Nations report on conditions affecting the civilian population within the meaning of the resolutions. In this connection, the Secretary-General recalls that Mr. Nils Gussing, ~~with the concurrence of the Israel Government~~, went

to the Near East in July 1967 as his Special Representative to obtain on-the-spot information required for the effective discharge at that time by the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under Security Council resolution 237 (1967).

"The Secretary-General considers that, in view of the indicated circumstances, it would be useful once again for him to send a representative to the area, particularly in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to meet his reporting obligations under the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Indeed, the Secretary-General feels that a positive step of this kind at this time could serve a number of useful purposes."

Insert

When the Secretary-General refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

The Secretary-General's Note confirms that my government accepted his proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Ambassador Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel has nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a better position than the Secretary-General himself to discuss the matter, and whether this conference will be asked to draw conclusions and make judgments for which the Secretary-General

has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this Conference should not be put x into such an untenable position, and should reject outright any proposal that might be submitted on the substance of the matter. In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, my delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the U.A.R., apart from a general disclaimer.

What we propose in x effect is a cease-fire. The Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in general terms as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. If Arab colleagues reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursing their political offensive, my delegation must reserve the right to make a full statement explaining matters ~~to explain matters~~ as we see them. That would include dealing fully with the allegations made by the representative of the U.A.R. We still hope that necessity will not arise.

We are above all conscious that our strife-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants - Arab and Jew alike. Verbal warfare in Teheran, tense and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a cease-fire, and we have tried to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
on 30.4.1968, after vote on inclusion
of Arab agenda item.

Mr. President,

The item which has just been adopted refers to human rights in occupied territories. The subject has universal application. My delegation has already pointed out that the Conference lacks preparation and documentation. I would formally request that this work of belated preparation now be undertaken, so as to provide some basis for sensible and intelligent discussion.

I would mention as a minimum list of background papers - that need to be prepared, the following:

(a) a historical survey of the subject,

(b) a list of occupied territories,

(c) a list of all international instruments that may be relevant to the topic - their texts and their degree of implementation,

(d) a juridical analysis of the concept of an "occupied territory".

I would endorse what has been said so well already by the distinguished representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and of France and of Chile that the discussion should be general and confined to the clarification of principles, while concrete situations should be left to the United Nations organs charged with dealing with them, and in a position to ascertain the facts. But general principles cannot be clarified without the minimum of information and data being made available and studied. My delegation will once more strive to avoid needless polemics and recriminiations, while reserving the right to deal with any specific issues which may be raised.

Finally, Mr. President, my delegation regards the vote which has taken place as amply indicating the misgiving I expressed this morning before the vote. Of the whole Conference, only 46 delegations supported the inclusion of the item,

including all the Arab delegations, and including a number of delegations who have insisted on general principles being discussed, rather than a specific Middle East situation. As against that, 36 32 delegations abstained in the vote, thereby indicating their disapproval of the item. The result is therefore a moral defeat for the promoters of the item.

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
on 30.4.1968, after vote on inclusion
of Arab agenda item.

Mr. President,

The item which has just been adopted refers to human rights in occupied territories. The subject has universal application. My delegation has already pointed out that the Conference lacks preparation and documentation. I would formally request that this work of belated preparation now be undertaken, so as to provide some basis for sensible and intelligent discussion.

I would mention as a minimum list of background papers - that need to be prepared, the following:

(a) a historical survey of the subject,

(b) a list of occupied territories,

(c) a list of all international instruments that may be relevant to the topic - their texts and their degree of implementation,

(d) a juridical analysis of the concept of an "occupied territory".

I would endorse what has been said so well already by the distinguished representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and of France and of Chile that the discussion should be general and confined to the clarification of principles, while concrete situations should be left to the United Nations organs charged with dealing with them, and in a position to ascertain the facts. But general principles cannot be clarified without the minimum of information and data being made available and studied. My delegation will once more strive to avoid needless polemics and recriminiations, while reserving the right to deal with any specific issues which may be raised.

Finally, Mr. President, my delegation regards the vote which has taken place as amply indicating the misgiving I expressed this morning before the vote. Of the whole Conference, only 46 delegations supported the inclusion of the item,

including all the Arab delegations, and including a number of delegations who have insisted on general principles being discussed, rather than a specific Middle East situation. As against that, 36 32 delegations abstained in the vote, thereby indicating their disapproval of the item. The result is therefore a moral defeat for the promoters of the item.

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay
on 30.4.1968, after vote on inclusion
of Arab agenda item.

Mr. President,

The item which has just been adopted refers to human rights in occupied territories. The subject has universal application. My delegation has already pointed out that the Conference lacks preparation and documentation. I would formally request that this work of belated preparation now be undertaken, so as to provide some basis for sensible and intelligent discussion.

I would mention as a minimum list of background papers - that need to be prepared, the following:

(a) a historical survey of the subject,

(b) a list of occupied territories,

(c) a list of all international instruments that may be relevant to the topic - their texts and their degree of implementation,

(d) a juridical analysis of the concept of an "occupied territory".

I would endorse what has been said so well already by the distinguished representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and of France and of Chile that the discussion should be general and confined to the clarification of principles, while concrete situations should be left to the United Nations organs charged with dealing with them, and in a position to ascertain the facts. But general principles cannot be clarified without the minimum of information and data being made available and studied. My delegation will once more strive to avoid needless polemics and recriminiations, while reserving the right to deal with any specific issues which may be raised.

Finally, Mr. President, my delegation regards the vote which has taken place as amply indicating the misgiving I expressed this morning before the vote. Of the whole Conference, only 46 delegations supported the inclusion of the item,

including all the Arab delegations, and including a number of delegations who have insisted on general principles being discussed, rather than a specific Middle East situation. As against that, ~~25~~ 32 delegations abstained in the vote, thereby indicating their disapproval of the item. The result is therefore a moral defeat for the promoters of the item.

Statement by Ambassador Michael Comay,
Chairman of Israel Delegation, in
Plenary Session on 20.4.1968

Inscription of New Agenda Item on
Occupied Territories

Madam President,

When the proposal to inscribe a new item concerning occupied territories came before the General Committee yesterday, my delegation requested permission to state its views before the Committee. As Israel is a participating State that has a direct interestx in this item, it would have been in accordance with accepted United Nations' practice for my delegation to be heard. Nine members of the General Committee demonstrated their sense of fair-play and their respect for the parliamentary traditions of the United Nations, by supporting our application, and I would here express my delegation's appreciation to them. Nine other members of the Committee voted against it and thereby blocked our right to speak on our own behalf. They consisted of the Arab representatives who were promoting this item, and certain other delegations who have identified themselves with the Arab side in its mx conflict with Israel. I will let decent opinion in this Conference draw its own conclusions from this unworthy effort to make an anti-Israel move, but to prevent the representatives of Israel from expressing their views. But my delegation has no intention of allowing itself to be muzzled at this Conference. We shall take the present opportunity of saying everything we have in mind to say about the inscription of this agenda item. Moreover, in the debate which is to follow on this item, we shall make it our business to place beforethis Conference, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about the Middle East situation, and reveal the naked propaganda and political intent underlying this item.

Firstly, let it be clearly stated that there was no real justification for inscribing this item at all, and that it has been done to the detriment of the

Teheran Conference.

The General Assembly has rules of procedure for additonal and supplementary items on the agenda. No such provision is made in the rules of procedure of this Conference. The omission is not accidental. The planning of an international conference of this kind normally takes two or three years. Its scope and subject matter need to be carefully and precisely formulated well in advance, in the form of a provisional agenda which then serves as the basis for the preparatory work, documentation, instructions to delegations, and so forth. A new item, injected after the Conference has already started, can only disrupt and disorganize its plan of work and time-table. Moreover, it must lead to confused and superficial debate not based on preliminary study, discussion and fact-finding. Even the General Assembly rules provide safeguards against adding a late item. This is confined to matters which are "urgent and important", and require a two-thirds majority. There is nothing "urgent and important" for this Conference about a question which has existed for a long time, and is anyway being dealt with by the Security Council and the General Assembly through the Secretary-General.

The lengthy and elaborate process that attended the shaping of the provisional agenda of this Conference, appears from paragraph 3 of the Annotated Provisional Agenda (Doc. A/CONF.32/1/Add.1). The Preparatory Committee was set up by the General Assembly over two years ago, and its proposals for the agenda were considered by two successive General Assemblies after that, the 21st and 22nd regular sessions.

In any case, the proposed item is superfluous. There is nothing to be said or proposed about it which could not be said or proposed in the course of the twenty-year review of human rights under agenda item 9. Arab delegates have been taking up a great deal of time on that discussion, and no one has ruled them out of order. The reasons for proposing a separate item do not arise from the need to fill a gap in the provisional agenda, but are solely propaganda reasons.

The pitfalls of injecting a new item that has not been considered or prepared in the preliminary work for the Conference, are vividly illustrated by the present Arab proposal. For instance:

(a) It raises the fundamental question of policy whether the Conference should concern itself only with general principles relating to human rights, or should also get involved with specific local situations, thus creating a dangerous precedent. The language of the item may be general, but that is mere camouflage, as is clear from the sponsorship of the item and the terms in which it was put forward in the General Committee. I venture to suggest that not a single delegation in this hall is deceived as to the intent of the item. There are a vast number of specific situations and conflicts involving human rights, some of them referred to in the general debate on agenda item 9. Is the Conference even in principle willing to inscribe special items and take specific action on the negro problem in the United States, or political freedoms in Eastern Europe, or conflicts in Africa or South-East Asia, or the special needs and problems of this or that specific minority group. Take our region alone. What about respect and implementation of human rights in the Yemen war, where villages have been mercilessly bombed, civilian populations massacred and poison gas has been used? What about the Iraqi decimation of its Kurdish minority? Is the representative of Iraq willing to have this Conference examine into that situation, and inscribe an item on the agenda for that purpose? What about certain states in our area that are police states, where freedom of speech and political dissent and press are suppressed and punished, and the individual is subject to arbitrary arrest by the State? What about the Southern Sudan, where the African population is harshly suppressed by force by a dominant Arab race in the north? Are we to get involved in all these situations? If not, what justification is there for involving the Conference in one single local situation which is already being fully dealt with by United Nations organs?

I suggest the only answer to these questions that makes any sense at all is that the Conference should regard specific and local situations and conflicts as beyond its competence. It simply does not have the time, the means, the capacity or the authority to receive any such situations onto its agenda and thereb commit itself to accepting responsibility for them. Any other course can only completely discredit the Conference, and destroy its ability to carry out the general tasks entrusted to it. If that is the correct approach, it is mischievous to set a precedent to the contrary, simply out of unwillingness to take a clear or firm position on the part of those many delegations that genuinely were opposed to the inscription of the item. I would respectfully suggest to those of my colleagues who may feel honest doubts about the wisdom of this item, to register those doubts by at least abstaining in a vote on the inclusion of the item. I realise it is sometimes difficult to vote against any matter connected with human rights. My delegation will not participate in this vote at all, as we believe this item is beyond the competence of the Conference and contradicts its true interests.

(b) Even if it chooses to deal with a specific situation, the Conference is not in a position to do so without a thorough prior on-the-spot investigation of the facts. It has no available means of doing so. From the debate which has already taken place, it is clear that the discussion will continue to be emotional, demagogic, and based on "ex parte" statements, newspaper clippings and similar materials, without reference to a set of verified facts. It would be pointless for the Conference to spend its time debating the merits of the issues on such a flimsy basis, at a time when the Secretary-General was actually sending a representative on a fact-finding mission in the area.

(c) The further question of policy arises, whether a U.N. Conference should attempt to deal with matters that are already being dealt with by other competent U.N. organs. In this case, both the Security Council and the General Assembly have already adopted resolutions concerning the humanitarian aspect of the general situation in the Middle East, and the conditions and welfare of the civilian populations in the area of conflict, which includes not only occupied territories but certain Arab countries as well. Both these principal organs have entrusted to the Secretary-General the task of reporting; and the Secretary-General himself does not presume to fulfil that task without sending his own representatives on on-the-spot fact-finding missions. It would not be helpful to deal in any other way with so complex a matter, involving the

administration of extensive territories containing over a million inhabitants. There is also the question of minority groups in a number of Arab countries.

When one compares the proposed item with the existing United Nations resolutions, one finds that it is deliberately slanted. The item tires to confine the discussion to territories administered by Israel, whereas the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions cover the civilian population in the whole area of conflict, including the Arab countries surrounding Israel.

Take for instance, the preamble of Security Council Resolution S/237 of 14 June 1967. It reads:

"The Security Council,

Considering the urgent need to spare the civil populations and the prisoners of the war in the area of conflict in the Middle East additional sufferings,

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights should be respected even during the vicissitudes of war,

Considering that all the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949 should be complied with by the parties involved in the conflict,"

In the operative part of the resolution, the first paragraph is addressed to the Government of Israel and the second one to all the governments concerned, concerning the scrupulous respect of humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions.

The General Assembly resolution A/2252 of 4 Julo 1967, speaks of the urgent need to alleviate suffering inflicted on all civilians and prisoners-of-war as a result of the hostilities in the Middle East. It then quotes in full the above Security Council resolution. After that, the resolution refers to the work of the Red Cross, UNICEF, UNRWA and other humanitarian activities in the areas as a whole.

Nowhere in these resolutions is there any mention of "occupied territories". That is not a United Nations term. As to some of the territories presently held by us they were militarily occupied by Egypt & Jordan in 1948.

As has already been said, the task of following and reporting on the implementation of these resolutions is entrusted to the Secretary-General. How has he carried out this task? In July 1967, he sent a Special Representative, Ambassador Niels Gussing of Sweden, to gather the facts for him. Mr. Gussing's mission was not confined to Israel-held territories, but extended to the plight of civilian groups, especially the Jewish minorities in the Arab countries as well. My Government cooperated with Mr. Gussing. The Secretary-General is now about to initiate a second fact-finding mission. He addressed Notes to four governments, those of the U.A.R., Syria, Jordan and Israel, and has now published his Notes to them and their replies. It is clear from these United Nations documents that the terms of reference of the Secretary-General's representative will include the treatment of the Jewish minorities of the Arab countries concerne

In the light of the U.N. handling of these questions till now, as I have described it, it is clear how slanted and one-sided is the wording of the Arab item now proposed to this Conference. It avoids referring to the area of conflict, as the U.N. resolutions do, but tries to limit and confine the discussion just to the civilian population in Israel-held areas. By this strategm they hope to divert attention from, and to shirk accountability for, the situation in their own countries.

That strategem will not work. We have nothing to hide about our record - but these territories do not exist in outer space. They are elements in a certain situation, and our administration of them must be set in the context of its background of conflict and the regional circumstances. We must talk about the impact of the conflict on human relations on both sides of the cease-fire lines, and not only on one side of them, as Arab delegations would no doubt prefer to do. Moreover, the Israel delegation has certainly not come to Teheran to be prisoners in the dock facing Arab prosecutors. Those who wish to criticise the behaviour of others must subject their own behaviour to scrutiny. To be precise, our administration of these territories should legitimately be

restraint under attack, and eventually by refraining altogether from reply or reaction. Yet here the Conference is being asked deliberately to revive these polemics, by devoting a complete new agenda item to them. It is the privilege of the Conference to do so, if it wishes. But there is no x obligation to do so. The Conference is entitled to consider whether it is in the interests of its work, and ~~will it~~ whether it will promote constructive results. There is a serious responsibility involved.

There can be no doubt about the destructive impact of the inclusion of this item would have on the work of the Conference and the prospects for its success. The effect would be threefold: it would consume valuable time and energy; it would continue to poison the atmosphere with political recriminations; and it would go on engaging the attention of the press and the public opinion, thereby creating an unfortunate and misleading impression that the Conference was taken up with superficial polemics on unplanned and unprepared political issues, instead of doing serious and organized work on a planned and prepared agenda.

My delegation would, therefore, urge the Conference to give careful thought on the matter, in the light of all its implications.

One final observation, to which my delegation will revert in due course.

As was sowisely said by M. René Cassin - and by others, in the last resort human rights depend on conditions of peace. That truth applies with special force to our strife-torn area, and to the welfare and security of the civilian populations in it.

Statement in Right of Reply by Ambassador Michael Comay on 24.4.1968

1) Quote on previous statement

Yesterday my delegation replied briefly and reluctantly to the usual smear attacks upon my country by Arab representatives. We would hope that the exchange will be allowed to rest there, and that the work of the conference will be allowed to proceed free of this type of digression.

My Government prefers to state its views at the proper time and place, which is certainly not at this conference. We have no desire to be drawn into polemics that can only make Dr. Jarring's task more difficult, and disrupt and prejudice the tasks confronting this conference. If we are attacked again, we will have to set the record straight. I am sure it is the wish of the overwhelming majority of other delegations present, that the need to do so will not arise.

The record is clear - who has imposed this political debate on the conference.

It is our duty to set the factual record straight.

U.A.R. - Study Group to investigate his charges against Israel.

Netherlands - Cannot usurp the functions of other U.N. organs - in this case the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.

Officially announced that the Secretary-General is about to send a special representative to the area on a fact-finding mission, concerning the welfare and safety of the civilian populations. Is this Conference to set up competitive machinery for this purpose? Or is this Conference being asked to make judgments on the basis of "ex parte" statements and newspaper stories, without ascertaining the facts? It is clear that such a task is beyond the competence of the Conference, and outside its scope. Otherwise, the Conference would be obliged to set aside its agenda and convert itself into a Court of Appeal on all local situations, conflicts or complaints anywhere in the world.

I would remind the U.A.R. representative that the "Middle East area of conflict" includes Egypt, and the Secretary-General has agreed that his representative will be charged, inter alia, with examining the situation of the Jewish community in that country. What are the facts?

The Situation in Egypt

1. In Egypt the Jewish community in the late '40s numbered 75,000 to 80,000 souls. Almost all of them had to leave the country and find refuge for themselves somewhere else. When the Six Day War broke out there were no more than 2,500 Jews, about 1,500 in Cairo and 1,000 in Alexandria. Some of them possess foreign nationality or are stateless, while others possess Egyptian nationality.

2. When the fighting began on June 5th hundreds of Jews were arrested and held in inhuman conditions in prison without food or water. Almost all the men, apart from the very old and sick, were imprisoned. They were confined in the Abu Zaabal prison near Cairo and the Al-Burja prison near Alexandria. Their only crime was being Jewish. In these prisons, Jewish captives were subject to ill-treatment and gross indignities. Synagogues were sequestrated and Jews were forbidden to pray except in the synagogue of Alexandria, where they were limited to two or three times a week.

3. Upon intervention of foreign states, several hundred Jews who were their nationals, were allowed to leave Egypt. The remaining Jews who are either stateless or Egyptian subjects continue to live in misery and exist on charities granted by the Jewish community.

4. Towards the end of 1967 the Egyptian authorities began to release Jewish prisoners from goal. They were freed in small groups and expelled from Egypt with their families. They had to sign statements waiving their Egyptian nationality (if they were in possession of such) and their entire property. Upon leaving Egypt, they were allowed to take with them only personal belongings. The Jewish community which was permitted by the Egyptians to use a small part of its funds,

allocated each deportee the sum of five Egyptian pounds.

5. About 250 Jews are still imprisoned. Towards the end of December 1967 they were transferred to Al-Thawra prison near Cairo. Today the situation of the remnant of Jews in Egypt is grim. They are close to starvation, having been deprived of all sources of income, employment and property. They are in dire need of help.

If there were a working group and a resolution as the U.A.R. suggests, my delegation would expect it to deal with the situation inside the Arab countries, and especially that of their Jewish communities. As regards respect for human rights generally, my country is fully prepared to have its record compared point by point with that of any Arab state whose representatives have come here to attack us.

The Gaza Strip calls for some factual comment:

(a) Gaza Strip under Egyptian Rule:

The situation we found in taking over the Strip was a bleak one. Under the Egyptian military regime, the territory remained a dead-end street for refugees and non-refugees alike. They were not allowed to assimilate themselves to Egyptian life and economy and they were discouraged from going elsewhere. They were granted no political rights. The refugees were tye majority of the inhabitants with slight prospect of being locally absorbed. In brief, the Gaza Strip had become a stagnant concentration camp and the Egyptian record was one of indifference at best and oppression at worst (for instance, a curfew at night was a permanent feature of Gaza life). The main Egyptian contribution to the economic well-being of the inhabitants was to conscript some 12,000 young men for their fighting forces.

Of course difficulties arise when our Security Forces take action against terrorists and murderers infiltrated from outside, who are aided and abetted by Arab governments. We must discharge our duty under the relevant resolutions to preserve the "safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants".

without serious strife. That phenomenon is the basis for some sober confidence for the future of Israel-Arab relations in the Middle East, and for the future of the refugees.

Security Council Resolutions quoted by U.A.R. representative, who complained that the U.A.R. accepted that resolution, and Israel did not. That is a deliberately misleading statement.

What is acceptance for the U.A.R.? Publicly proclaimed loyalty to decisions taken by Arab Summit Conference at Khartoum some ~~xxxxxx~~ months ago. "No negotiations, no peace, no recognition.

Israel - negotiations yes, peace yes, recognition yes.

Jarring's talks? Not at liberty to disclose confidential talks with him, but when record is disclosed, not Israel will have a great deal of explaining to do.

Public record? Ambassador Jarring's recent report - Secretary-General to Security Council - striving for meetings between the parties under his auspices! Last month, he made a proposal for a Conference under his auspices. Only Israel accepted. The intransigent attitude of Cairo is now the major obstacle to a political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

Syria: Ignore except for one single point, to which take strong exception. - He read from an obscure publication of which no member of my delegation has ever heard. In this publication an unnamed Israeli soldier - I submit does not exist - is alleged to have seen atrocities committed by the Israel Army. We in Israel cherish our Defence Army and are very proud of its human standards. It is a Citizen Army, made up of all able-bodied men in the country, and pledged to defend our country against its enemies. The courage and skill with which our soldiers perform their duties, at the risk of death, have elicited world-wide admiration. Our soldiers to not ambush women and children, do not shoot wounded men and do not kill or torture prisoners to whom the representatives of the International Red Cross have complete access.

That is a dirty slur, which I reject with all the contempt it deserves. If the representative of Syria were to devote less attention to stirring up mud, and try to make a constructive contribution to our debates, our common cause would be better served.

One final comment. A story has been splashed in the local press, from Arab sources, that my delegation is seeking election as a Vice-President of the Conference, but is being thwarted by a threatened Arab walk-out. This silly story is quite baseless. We are not a candidate for that office, and I would hope that the newspapers that have been misled will give equal prominence to our denial.

Statement in Right of Reply by Ambassador Michael Comay on 24.4.1968

1) Quote on previous statement

Yesterday my delegation replied briefly and reluctantly to the usual smear attacks upon my country by Arab representatives. We would hope that the exchange will be allowed to rest there, and that the work of the conference will be allowed to proceed free of this type of digression.

My Government prefers to state its views at the proper time and place, which is certainly not at this conference. We have no desire to be drawn into polemics that can only make Dr. Jarring's task more difficult, and disrupt and prejudice the tasks confronting this conference. If we are attacked again, we will have to set the record straight. I am sure it is the wish of the overwhelming majority of other delegations present, that the need to do so will not arise.

The record is clear - who has imposed this political debate on the conference.

It is our duty to set the factual record straight.

U.A.R. - Study Group to investigate his charges against Israel.

Netherlands - Cannot usurp the functions of other U.N. organs - in this case the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.

Officially announced that the Secretary-General is about to send a special representative to the area on a fact-finding mission, concerning the welfare and safety of the civilian populations. Is this Conference to set up competitive machinery for this purpose? Or is this Conference being asked to make judgments on the basis of "ex parte" statements and newspaper stories, without ascertaining the facts? It is clear that such a task is beyond the competence of the Conference, and outside its scope. Otherwise, the Conference would be obliged to set aside its agenda and convert itself into a Court of Appeal on all local situations, conflicts or complaints anywhere in the world.

I would remind the U.A.R. representative that the "Middle East area of conflict" includes Egypt, and the Secretary-General has agreed that his representative will be charged, inter alia, with examining the situation of the Jewish community in that country. What are the facts?

The Situation in Egypt

1. In Egypt the Jewish community in the late '40s numbered 75,000 to 80,000 souls. Almost all of them had to leave the country and find refuge for themselves somewhere else. When the Six Day War broke out there were no more than 2,500 Jews, about 1,500 in Cairo and 1,000 in Alexandria. Some of them possess foreign nationality or are stateless, while others possess Egyptian nationality.

2. When the fighting began on June 5th hundreds of Jews were arrested and held in inhuman conditions in prison without food or water. Almost all the men, apart from the very old and sick, were imprisoned. They were confined in the Abu Zaabal prison near Cairo and the Al-Burja prison near Alexandria. Their only crime was being Jewish. In these prisons, Jewish captives were subject to ill-treatment and gross indignities. Synagogues were sequestrated and Jews were forbidden to pray except in the synagogue of Alexandria, where they were limited to two or three times a week.

3. Upon intervention of foreign states, several hundred Jews who were their nationals, were allowed to leave Egypt. The remaining Jews who are either stateless or Egyptian subjects continue to live in misery and exist on charities granted by the Jewish community.

4. Towards the end of 1967 the Egyptian authorities began to release Jewish prisoners from goal. They were freed in small groups and expelled from Egypt with their families. They had to sign statements waiving their Egyptian nationality (if they were in possession of such) and their entire property. Upon leaving Egypt, they were allowed to take with them only personal belongings. The Jewish community which was permitted by the Egyptians to use a small part of its funds,

allocated each deportee the sum of five Egyptian pounds.

5. About 250 Jews are still imprisoned. Towards the end of December 1967 they were transferred to Al-Thawra prison near Cairo. Today the situation of the remnant of Jews in Egypt is grim. They are close to starvation, having been deprived of all sources of income, employment and property. They are in dire need of help.

If there were a working group and a resolution as the U.A.R. suggests, my delegation would expect it to deal with the situation inside the Arab countries, and especially that of their Jewish communities. As regards respect for human rights generally, my country is fully prepared to have its record compared point by point with that of any Arab state whose representatives have come here to attack us.

The Gaza Strip calls for some factual comment:

(a) Gaza Strip under Egyptian Rule:

The situation we found in taking over the Strip was a bleak one. Under the Egyptian military regime, the territory remained a dead-end street for refugees and non-refugees alike. They were not allowed to assimilate themselves to Egyptian life and economy and they were discouraged from going elsewhere. They were granted no political rights. The refugees were tye majority of the inhabitants with slight prospect of being locally absorbed. In brief, the Gaza Strip had become a stagnant concentration camp and the Egyptian record was one of indifference at best and oppression at worst (for instance, a curfew at night was a permanent feature of Gaza life). The main Egyptian contribution to the economic well-being of the inhabitants was to conscript some 12,000 young men for their fighting forces.

Of course difficulties arise when our Security Forces take action against terrorists and murderers infiltrated from outside, who are aided and abetted by Arab governments. We must discharge our duty under the relevant resolutions to preserve the "safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants".

When one bears in mind that the area was recently convulsed by war, that the basic political questions remain unresolved, that the Arab population is bombarded from all around with incitement and calls to revolt, and that there is organized terrorist activity from Syria and Jordan, it is remarkable with what little trouble or friction ordinary life goes on, and what a high degree of cooperation has developed. Anyone travelling through these areas (as thousands of visitors do every week) can see the villagers tilling their fields or bringing their produce in to market; the shops full of customers and the churches and mosques open to worshippers; the children at school; commerce carried on as usual; transportation, water, electricity and other public services restored and functioning; most of the Arab officials, teachers and policemen at their jobs; the same Arab mayors and village mukhtars still in office, and the local authorities continuing to run the affairs of their communities. Restrictions on movement are practically non-existent, and great numbers of people, Jews and Arabs alike, are eagerly visiting areas from which they have been cut off for twenty years.

On its record till now, and its economic and social programmes for the period ahead, the Israel Government can properly claim that it is discharging its responsibilities towards the inhabitants of the areas, and ensuring their safety, welfare and security.

I do not wish to suggest that there are no problems. That would be neither truthful nor convincing. There are resentment and suspicion surving from the past, some difficulties of economic and emotional adjustment to the present, and anxiety about the future. All that is natural. But conditions are in every way better than anyone would have dared to expect some months ago.

What is reassuring is that daily life is so normal, and above all that the barriers are crumbling and people are mingling freely. Incidents and clashes along the cease-fire lines are regularly reported in the press. The great untold story is that in that area presently held by Israel, two- and-a-quarter million Jews and one-and-a-quarter million Arabs are co-existing

without serious strife. That phenomenon is the basis for some sober confidence for the future of Israel-Arab relations in the Middle East, and for the future of the refugees.

Security Council Resolutions quoted by U.A.R. representative, who complained that the U.A.R. accepted that resolution, and Israel did not. That is a deliberately misleading statement.

What is acceptance for the U.A.R.? Publicly proclaimed loyalty to decisions taken by Arab Summit Conference at Khartoum some xxxxxx months ago. "No negotiations, no peace, no recognition.

Israel - negotiations yes, peace yes, recognition yes.

Jarring's talks? Not at liberty to disclose confidential talks with him, but when record is disclosed, not Israel will have a great deal of explaining to do.

Public record? Ambassador Jarring's recent report - Secretary-General to Security Council - striving for meetings between the parties under his auspices! Last month, he made a proposal for a Conference under his auspices. Only Israel accepted. The intransigent attitude of Cairo is now the major obstacle to a political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

Syria: Ignore except for one single point, to which take strong exception. - He read from an obscure publication of which no member of my delegation has ever heard. In this publication an unnamed Israeli soldier - I submit does not exist - is alleged to have seen atrocities committed by the Israel Army. We in Israel cherish our Defence Army and are very proud of its human standards. It is a Citizen Army, made up of all able-bodied men in the country, and pledged to defend our country against its enemies. The courage and skill with which our soldiers perform their duties, at the risk of death, have elicited world-wide admiration. Our soldiers to not ambush women and children, do not shoot wounded men and do not kill or torture prisoners to whom the representatives of the International Red Cross have complete access.

That is a dirty slur, which I reject with all the contempt it deserves. If the representative of Syria were to devote less attention to stirring up mud, and try to make a constructive contribution to our debates, our common cause would be better served.

One final comment. A story has been splashed in the local press, from Arab sources, that my delegation is seeking election as a Vice-President of the Conference, but is being thwarted by a threatened Arab walk-out. This silly story is quite baseless. We are not a candidate for that office, and I would hope that the newspapers that have been misled will give equal prominence to our denial.

Statement in Right of Reply by Ambassador Michael Comay on 24.4.1968

1) Quote on previous statement

Yesterday my delegation replied briefly and reluctantly to the usual smear attacks upon my country by Arab representatives. We would hope that the exchange will be allowed to rest there, and that the work of the conference will be allowed to proceed free of this type of digression.

My Government prefers to state its views at the proper time and place, which is certainly not at this conference. We have no desire to be drawn into polemics that can only make Dr. Jarring's task more difficult, and disrupt and prejudice the tasks confronting this conference. If we are attacked again, we will have to set the record straight. I am sure it is the wish of the overwhelming majority of other delegations present, that the need to do so will not arise.

The record is clear - who has imposed this political debate on the conference.

It is our duty to set the factual record straight.

U.A.R. - Study Group to investigate his charges against Israel.

Netherlands - Cannot usurp the functions of other U.N. organs - in this case the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.

Officially announced that the Secretary-General is about to send a special representative to the area on a fact-finding mission, concerning the welfare and safety of the civilian populations. Is this Conference to set up competitive machinery for this purpose? Or is this Conference being asked to make judgments on the basis of "ex parte" statements and newspaper stories, without ascertaining the facts? It is clear that such a task is beyond the competence of the Conference, and outside its scope. Otherwise, the Conference would be obliged to set aside its agenda and convert itself into a Court of Appeal on all local situations, conflicts or complaints anywhere in the world.

I would remind the U.A.R. representative that the "Middle East area of conflict" includes Egypt, and the Secretary-General has agreed that his representative will be charged, inter alia, with examining the situation of the Jewish community in that country. What are the facts?

The Situation in Egypt

1. In Egypt the Jewish community in the late '40s numbered 75,000 to 80,000 souls. Almost all of them had to leave the country and find refuge for themselves somewhere else. When the Six Day War broke out there were no more than 2,500 Jews, about 1,500 in Cairo and 1,000 in Alexandria. Some of them possess foreign nationality or are stateless, while others possess Egyptian nationality.

2. When the fighting began on June 5th hundreds of Jews were arrested and held in inhuman conditions in prison without food or water. Almost all the men, apart from the very old and sick, were imprisoned. They were confined in the Abu Zaabal prison near Cairo and the Al-Burja prison near Alexandria. Their only crime was being Jewish. In these prisons, Jewish captives were subject to ill-treatment and gross indignities. Synagogues were sequestrated and Jews were forbidden to pray except in the synagogue of Alexandria, where they were limited to two or three times a week.

3. Upon intervention of foreign states, several hundred Jews who were their nationals, were allowed to leave Egypt. The remaining Jews who are either stateless or Egyptian subjects continue to live in misery and exist on charities granted by the Jewish community.

4. Towards the end of 1967 the Egyptian authorities began to release Jewish prisoners from goal. They were freed in small groups and expelled from Egypt with their families. They had to sign statements waiving their Egyptian nationality (if they were in possession of such) and their entire property. Upon leaving Egypt, they were allowed to take with them only personal belongings. The Jewish community which was permitted by the Egyptians to use a small part of its funds,

allocated each deportee the sum of five Egyptian pounds.

5. About 250 Jews are still imprisoned. Towards the end of December 1967 they were transferred to Al-Thawra prison near Cairo. Today the situation of the remnant of Jews in Egypt is grim. They are close to starvation, having been deprived of all sources of income, employment and property. They are in dire need of help.

If there were a working group and a resolution as the U.A.R. suggests, my delegation would expect it to deal with the situation inside the Arab countries, and especially that of their Jewish communities. As regards respect for human rights generally, my country is fully prepared to have its record compared point by point with that of any Arab state whose representatives have come here to attack us.

The Gaza Strip calls for some factual comment:

(a) Gaza Strip under Egyptian Rule:

The situation we found in taking over the Strip was a bleak one. Under the Egyptian military regime, the territory remained a dead-end street for refugees and non-refugees alike. They were not allowed to assimilate themselves to Egyptian life and economy and they were discouraged from going elsewhere. They were granted no political rights. The refugees were tye majority of the inhabitants with slight prospect of being locally absorbed. In brief, the Gaza Strip had become a stagnant concentration camp and the Egyptian record was one of indifference at best and oppression at worst (for instance, a curfew at night was a permanent feature of Gaza life). The main Egyptian contribution to the economic well-being of the inhabitants was to conscript some 12,000 young men for their fighting forces.

Of course difficulties arise when our Security Forces take action against terrorists and murderers infiltrated from outside, who are aided and abetted by Arab governments. We must discharge our duty under the relevant resolutions to preserve the "safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants".

When one bears in mind that the area was recently convulsed by war, that the basic political questions remain unresolved, that the Arab population is bombarded from all around with incitement and calls to revolt, and that there is organized terrorist activity from Syria and Jordan, it is remarkable with what little trouble or friction ordinary life goes on, and what a high degree of cooperation has developed. Anyone travelling through these areas (as thousands of visitors do every week) can see the villagers tilling their fields or bringing their produce in to makrot; the shops full of customers and the churches and mosques open to worshippers; the children at school; commerce carried on as usual; transportation, water, electricity and other public services restored and functioning; most of the Arab officials, teachers and policemen at their jobs; the same Arab mayors and village mukhtars still in office, and the local authorities continuing to run the affairs of their communities. Restrictions on movement are practically non-existent, and great numbers of people, Jews and Arabs alike, are eagerly visiting areas from which they have been cut off for twenty years.

On its record till now, and its economic and social programmes for the period ahead, the Israel Government can properly claim that it is discharging its responsibilities towards the inhabitants of the areas, and ensuring their safety, welfare and security.

I do not wish to suggest that there are no problems. That would be neither truthful nor convincing. There are resentment and suspicion surving from the past, some difficulties of economic and emotional adjustment to the present, and anxiety about the future. All that is natural. But conditions are in every way better than anyone would have dared to expect some months ago.

What is reassuring is that daily life is so normal, and above all that the barriers are crumbling and people are mingling freely. Incidents and clashes along the cease-fire lines are regularly reported in the press. The great untold story is that in that area presently held by Israel, two- and-a-quarter million Jews and one-and-a-quarter million Arabs are co-existing

without serious strife. That phenomenon is the basis for some sober confidence for the future of Israel-Arab relations in the Middle East, and for the future of the refugees.

Security Council Resolutions quoted by U.A.R. representative, who complained that the U.A.R. accepted that resolution, and Israel did not. That is a deliberately misleading statement.

What is acceptance for the U.A.R.? Publicly proclaimed loyalty to decisions taken by Arab Summit Conference at Khartoum some ~~xxxxxx~~ months ago. "No negotiations, no peace, no recognition.

Israel - negotiations yes, peace yes, recognition yes.

Jarring's talks? Not at liberty to disclose confidential talks with him, but when record is disclosed, not Israel will have a great deal of explaining to do.

Public record? Ambassador Jarring's recent report - Secretary-General to Security Council - striving for meetings between the parties under his auspices! Last month, he made a proposal for a Conference under his auspices. Only Israel accepted. The intransigent attitude of Cairo is now the major obstacle to a political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

Syria; Ignore except for one single point, to which take strong exception. - He read from an obscure publication of which no member of my delegation has ever heard. In this publication an unnamed Israeli soldier - I submit does not exist - is alleged to have seen atrocities committed by the Israel Army. We in Israel cherish our Defence Army and are very proud of its human standards. It is a Citizen Army, made up of all able-bodied men in the country, and pledged to defend our country against its enemies. The courage and skill with which our soldiers perform their duties, at the risk of death, have elicited world-wide admiration. Our soldiers to not ambush women and children, do not shoot wounded men and do not kill or torture prisoners to whom the representatives of the International Red Cross have complete access.

That is a dirty slur, which I reject with all the contempt it deserves. If the representative of Syria were to devote less attention to stirring up mud, and try to make a constructive contribution to our debates, our common cause would be better served.

One final comment. A story has been splashed in the local press, from Arab sources, that my delegation is seeking election as a Vice-President of the Conference, but is being thwarted by a threatened Arab walk-out. This silly story is quite baseless. We are not a candidate for that office, and I would hope that the newspapers that have been misled will give equal prominence to our denial.

4 copies

Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously respected;

Welcomes the ~~invitation~~ initiative of the General Secretary of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in document S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

~~Stresses the need for further study and clarification of the general principles relating to the above purposes.~~

Recommends to the General Assembly that consideration, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in

Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously resp ected;

Welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in docuement S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

Recommends to the General Assembly that considerations, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously resp ected;

Welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in docuement S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

Recommends to the General Assembly that considerations, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in

Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously resp ected;

Welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in document S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

Recommends to the General Assembly that considerations, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Respect and Implementation of Human Rights in Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously respected;

Welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in document S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

Recommends to the General Assembly that considerations, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Occupied Territories

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Considering that essential and inalienable human rights of the civilian population in areas of conflict and territories occupied as a result of armed conflict should be scrupulously resp ected;

Welcomes the initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send for this purpose a fact-finding mission to the area of conflict in the Middle East, as reflected in document S/8553 of 19th April 1960;

Endorses the need to respect and implement the human rights and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of such territories, in accordance with the humanitarian principles contained in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments;

Recommends to the General Assembly that considerations, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

Item 12 of the Agenda

RESPECT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

Afghanistan, India, Mali, Pakistan, Spain, Yugoslavia: Draft Resolution

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS:

Being guided by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Having heard the statements made in the conference with regard to the question of "Respect and Implementation of the Human Rights in the occupied territories," and noting the Note submitted by the Commissioner General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (Document A/Conf. 32/22)

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of August 12th 1949 regarding the protection of civilian persons in time of war;

Recalling Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) in which the Council and the Assembly considered that essential and inalienable rights should be respected even during the vicissitudes of war, and called upon the Government of Israel, to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have flet the areas of military operations since the outbreak of hostilities;

Recalling further Articles 2, 18 and 30 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and resolutions 2253 (ES-V) of July 4th 1967, and 2254 (ES-V) of July 14th 1967 adopted by the General Assembly calling upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem and deploring the failure of Israel to implement that resolution;

Mindful of the principle embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights regarding the right of everyone to return to his own country;

Further recalling:

(a) Resolution 6 (XXIV) of the Commission on Human Rights affirming the rights of the inhabitants who have left since the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East to return, and that the Government concerned should take the necessary measures in order to facilitate the return of those inhabitants to their own country without delay;

(b) The telegram dispatched by the Commission on Human Rights on 9th March 1968, calling upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of Arab civilian population inhabiting areas occupied by Israel;

1 - Expresses its grave concern for the violation of human rights in Arab territories occupied as a result of the June 1967 hostilities;
2 - Draws the attention of the Government of Israel to the grave consequences resulting from disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights in occupied territories;
3 - Calls for due respect for and implementation of human rights and the Geneva Conventions of August 12th, 1949 in occupied territories;
4 - Affirms the inalienable rights of all inhabitants who have left their homes as a result of the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East to return, resume normal life, recover their property and homes, and rejoin their families, according to the provision of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
5 - Requests the Commission on Human Rights to appoint a special committee to investigate violations of human rights in the territories occupied by Israel and to report thereon.
6 - Requests the Commission on Human Rights to keep the matter under constant review.

Amb. Comay
Item 12

14a

Insert page 14, after 1st para. under Refugees

At an early stage, we took up with UNRWA the long-standing question of incitement and inflammatory propaganda in school text-books. All such offensive matter was deleted by our education authorities in government schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We furnished UNRWA with full details, and requested similar steps in the refugee schools. UNRWA referred the matter to UNESCO, which co-operates with the Agency in running the refugee schools. After obtaining a report from its Director-General, the Executive Board of UNESCO adopted a resolution on the subject at its session in Paris in November 1967. The resolution declares incitement to hatred as contrary to the principles in the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and requests the Director-General to enter into talks with the Governments concerned to implement the resolution.

One example will show the extent to which the minds of young children have been poisoned in this way. In an elementary school in Khan Yunis, a town in the Gaza Strip, we found an exhibition of children's drawings on the walls. A central theme in the artistic self-expression of these little ones was the killing of Jews, depicted in the same ugly stereotype as in the cartoons I have mentioned. If Arabs and Israelis are ever to live in mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation, the process of reconciliation must start with the young in the schools. To the best of our knowledge, no positive step in this direction has been taken in any Arab country, in pursuance of the UNESCO resolution.

176.

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the

Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Hindus, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

Discrimination against minority groups in certain countries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

(e.g. Jews, Kurds, Africans in Southern Sudan, Christian groups).

24 April, 1968.

Madam President,

I have the honour to address you, in your capacity as Chairman of the General Committee, in order to request formally that my delegation be permitted to participate in the consideration of the request by the delegations of Jordan and Syria for the inscription of a new agenda item. ~~This may be of special interest to Israel.~~ As Your Highness is no doubt aware, such participation would be in accordance with established United Nations practice, as reflected in the procedure of the General Assembly.

I have the honour to be,
Your Highness,

Michael Comay
Chairman of the Israel Delegation

The President of the International Conference on Human Rights

Teheran, 27 April 1968

Madame President,

The undersigned Delegations of Jordan, Syria, U.A.R.

request the addition of the following item to:

"respect and implementation of Human "Rights in occupied territories"

to the provisional agenda of the International Conference on Human Rights.

Please accept our highest consideration.

Delegation of Jordan

Delegation of U.A.R.

Delegation of Syria

H. I. Highness,
Princess Ashraf,
President of the
International Conference
on Human Rights,
T e h e r a n

Thank Chairman & General Committee for opportunity to appear re item & proposed amendment

My delegation will explain why it is opposed to the inscription of the item as requested — analyse its implications. In our view it should be rejected altogether; but if accepted, it should be broadened and amended in the way suggested by our amendment.

Insert on Page 6 - after "our age". on bottom line.

It has rightly been stressed by some previous speakers that the promotion of human rights in the new and developing States cannot be divorced from the basic problems of their economic and social advance. Those who participated in the recent UNCTAD Conference, like I did, came away disheartened by the failure to deal decisively with the problems of development, and to remedy a situation in which the rich get richer and the poor stay poor.

Insert on Page 2 after end of first paragraph.

I would further point out that, regarding the safety, welfare and security of the civilian populations in the area of conflict, the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions request the Secretary-General to report from time to time. Last July the Secretary-General sent a Special Representative to the area, Ambassador Gussing, on a fact-finding mission. My Government cooperated fully. Recently the Secretary-General addressed notes to the Governments of the U.A.R., Jordan, Syria and Israel proposing that another representative be sent on a similar fact-finding mission. Again, my Government has agreed to cooperate with the Secretary-General and his representative. We have nothing to hide about our record in administering Israel-held territories, in ensuring the safety, welfare and security of the population concerned. In view of the wild and unfounded propaganda stories that are circulated, it would be useful to have an objective examination of the facts, under the proper auspices. Moreover, we are very much concerned about the ill-treatment of the Jewish communities in certain Arab countries, and the Secretary-General's Special Representative's task will cover an examination of this particular problem as well.

This information was publicly confirmed by the Secretary-General himself before leaving Teheran yesterday. I mention it to show that it would be beyond the competence of this Conference to concern itself with matters that are being dealt with by other United Nations' organs that have far better facilities for separating fact from fiction.

Insert on Page 6 - after"our age". on bottom line.

It has rightly been stressed by some previous speakers that the promotion of human rights in the new and developing States cannot be divorced from the basic problems of their economic and social advance. Those who participated in the recent UNCTAD Conference, like I did, came away disheartened by the failure to deal decisively with the problems of development, and to remedy a situation in which the rich get richer and the poor stay poor.

Insert on Page 9 - after end of first paragraph.

My delegation noted with interest the remarks made this morning by the distinguished Representative of the Philippines, on maintaining a balance between the special needs of a minority group and the general need for national unity.

Insert on Page 2 after end of first paragraph.

I would further point out that, regarding the safety, welfare and security of the civilian populations in the area of conflict, the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions request the Secretary-General to report from time to time. Last July the Secretary-General sent a Special Representative to the area, Ambassador Gussing, on a fact-finding mission. My Government cooperated fully. Recently the Secretary-General addressed notes to the Governments of the U.A.R., Jordan, Syria and Israel proposing that another representative be sent on a similar fact-finding mission. Again, my Government has agreed to cooperate with the Secretary-General and his representative. We have nothing to hide about our record in administering Israel-held territories, in ensuring the safety, welfare and security of the population concerned. In view of the wild and unfounded propaganda stories that are circulated, it would be useful to have an objective examination of the facts, under the proper auspices. Moreover, we are very much concerned about the ill-treatment of the Jewish communities in certain Arab countries, and the Secretary-General's Special Representative's task will cover an examination of this particular problem as well.

This information was publicly confirmed by the Secretary-General himself before leaving Teheran yesterday. I mention it to show that it would be beyond the competence of this Conference to concern itself with matters that are being dealt with by other United Nations' organs that have far better facilities for separating fact from fiction.

Insert on Page 6 - after"our age". on bottom line.

It has rightly been stressed by some previous speakers that the promotion of human rights in the new and developing States cannot be divorced from the basic problems of their economic and social advance. Those who participated in the recent UNCTAD Conference, like I did, came away disheartened by the failure to deal decisively with the problems of development, and to remedy a situation in which the rich get richer and the poor stay poor.

Insert on Page 9 - after end of first paragraph.

My delegation noted with interest the remarks made this morning by the distinguished Representative of the Philippines, on maintaining a balance between the special needs of a minority group and the general need for national unity.

Statement on Item 12.

(1) (1) Circumstances under which territories came into our possession
Arab belligerency since 1948. – mil occup. of West Bank + Gaza Strip, remained under
(2) eg. Administration;
W. Bank = annexed to Jordan –
relevant to situation we found.

(2) Arab Charges of aggression + withdrawal

(3) Gaza Strip conditions before after

(4) West Bank conditions before after

(5) — Resisting "Terrorism" — freedom to public
innocent before
(6) murder of Civilians

Public Statement by resistance leadership
(6) Public services
Economics + finance
Religion
Public order

(7) Refugees

Jews in Arab lands

up-to-date study of the facts. This conference is simply not in a position to form objective opinions.

~~up-to-date study of the facts~~ ~~study of the facts~~ study of the facts which might justify forming an opinion as basis for forming any opinion on the specific issue of the murder ~~Concerning the specific issue~~. The document published by the Secretary General in this regard is most significant. It refers to a document S/8553 of 19 April 1968, which is (also issued as a General Assembly document under the symbol A/7083) It is headed "Note by the Secretary General under Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly Resolution 2252 (ES-V)"

[Quote from para 2.]

[Quote from letter to Israel (p.2)

Quote Notes to Arab governments, para 5.

What is the Secretary-General telling us?

He says, firstly, that

Firstly allegations have been made and concerns expressed about the treatment accorded to civilians. In this context, ~~Israel~~ government has ~~(amongst others of the SG himself)~~ its own concern for the treatment of Jewish civilians in certain Arab countries involved in the conflict.

Secondly, the Secretary-General tells us that he is not in a position to report because

When the S.G refers to the concerns expressed to him, that includes the anxiety of the Israel Government about the fate of the Jewish communities in some of the Arab countries in the area of conflict. The Secretary-General assured us that that problem would be included in the scope of his representative's task. In this connection, it is worth repeating that the United Nations resolutions ~~that about~~ cover the civilian populations in the whole area of conflict.

Secretary-General's note

The ~~document~~ confirms that my government accepted ~~the~~ his ~~SG's~~ proposal, and expressed its willingness to cooperate with his representative, as we did with Amb. Gussing in 1967. This shows that Israel ~~is~~ has ~~that~~ nothing to conceal, and is quite prepared to submit its own record to international scrutiny. The question is whether this Conference is in a ~~the~~ better position than the S.G himself to discuss the matter ~~conditions affecting the~~ ~~Jordan~~ ~~populations~~ in the ~~Jordan~~ Middle East, and whether ~~this~~ this conference will be asked

to draw conclusions and make judgments when the SG. has certified that the relevant information is lacking. I submit this conference should not be put into such an untenable position.

~~In a spirit of cooperation,~~ and in order to facilitate the work of the conference, my delegation will refrain

My delegation suggests once more that we should avoid further discussion of the specific local issues in the Middle East area of conflict. ~~and Confine this item to General principles.~~ In a spirit of cooperation, we shall refrain from dealing with the unfounded statements just made by the representative of the UAR, apart from a general disclaimer. ~~that it is~~

What we propose in effect is a cease-fire.

the Conference should be enabled to deal with item 12 in ~~the~~ ~~Agenda~~ general terms, as the majority of delegations clearly would prefer to do. ~~If~~ Arab colleagues ~~refuse~~ reject this suggestion; if they insist on pursuing their political offensive attacks ~~on us~~, my delegation must reserve the right to ~~put the record straight and~~ explain matters as we see them. ~~It~~ That would include dealing ~~Next we would then also be obliged to deal~~ fully with the allegations made by the representative ~~we still are~~ of the U.A.R. ~~still making a valiant attempt~~ We still hope that necessity will not arise. ~~To avoid that necessity.~~ Above all, ~~#~~ We are conscious that

Our war-torn region is trying to grope its way towards peace ~~and regional cooperation~~, which is the best guarantee for the human rights of the inhabitants ~~of~~ Arab and Jew alike.

Verbal warfare in Tehran, ~~like~~ and acrimonious exchanges, are not calculated to promote the cause of peace. That is why my delegation has put forward its informal proposal for a ~~resolution~~ cease-fire, and we have ~~tried~~ to do so in a restrained and non-polemical manner. ~~It is~~ ~~our concern to be~~ ~~that we~~ ~~the best interests of the Conference itself.~~ We believe our suggestion is in the best interests of the Conference itself.