



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series D: International Relations Activities. 1961-1992

Box 75, Folder 7, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 1972.



THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

PARIS OFFICE: 30, Rue La Boetie, Paris 8, France • Elysees 69-11, 83-63 • Cable: Wishcom, Paris

Abraham Karlikow, European Director

FO-Eur

November 14, 1972

MEMORANDUM

To: Marc Tanenbaum ✓
From: Nives Fox
Subj: Jerusalem (Unesco General Conference)

NOV 20 1972

Arab determination to keep the political issue of Jerusalem alive as a constant nagging issue brought about yet another overwhelming castigation of Israel at Unesco's 17th General Assembly yesterday.

Not only did Israel get a trouncing on this occasion, but also Unesco's Director General Mr. René Maheu. For, in effect, the Assembly rejected a compromise solution he proposed last July, to appoint a technical assistance expert -- agreed to by Israel -- for organizing protection of cultural property in application of the Hague Convention. (See memo October 16.) At the Executive Board meeting of Unesco this November, Mr. Maheu had described this compromise as "corresponding to an extent which I consider as almost satisfactory at this stage" in reply to the Board's reiterated demand that he "ensure the presence of Unesco in the city of Jerusalem."

At the Plenary Session of the General Assembly yesterday, Arab states and their supporters attacked this as an obvious maneuver on the part of Israel to circumvent the request of an official Unesco presence in Jerusalem. Over and over they repeated the view that the city was being assaulted, damaged, changed and destroyed under "Israeli occupation," in spite of the 12 injunctions handed down ^{over 9 years} in various UN, Security Council and Unesco resolutions asking Israel to desist from doing so. The few delegates who rose to argue that Unesco's choice of an envoy -- albeit not an official representative of the organization -- could be at least the beginning of a solution failed to sway this Arab position.

Mr. Maheu beat retreat declaring that the dissatisfaction shown both by the Executive Board and the debate of the General Assembly had brought new elements into the situation: "I am not going back on my initiative and do not regret ~~my~~ my stand, which consisted in facilitating the maintenance of Jerusalem's cultural heritage by a certain Unesco presence within the limits of article 23 of the Hague Convention. But I respect the authority of this institution too much not to bend to its wishes. If the majority of this conference is not satisfied with the mechanism I proposed I no longer insist, you are sovereign."

PHILIP E. HOFFMAN, President ■ RICHARD MAASS, Chairman, National Executive Council ■ DAVID SHER, Chairman, Board of Governors ■ ELMER L. WINTER, Chairman, Board of Trustees ■ MORRIS H. BERGREEN, Treasurer ■ MRS. LEON C. SUNSTEIN, JR., Secretary ■ GERARD WEINSTOCK, Associate Treasurer ■ Honorary Presidents: MORRIS B. ABRAM, LOUIS CAPLAN, IRVING M. ENGEL, ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG ■ Honorary Vice-Presidents: NATHAN APPLEMAN, MRS. JACOB BLAUSTEIN, JACK A. GOLDFARB, JOSEPH KLINGENSTEIN, FRED LAZARUS, JR., JAMES MARSHALL, WILLIAM ROSENWALD ■ MAX M. FISHER, Honorary Chairman, National Executive Council ■ MAURICE GLINERT, Honorary Treasurer ■ JOHN SLAWSON, Executive Vice-President Emeritus ■ Vice-Presidents: BERNARD ABRAMS, Hartford; JEROME M. COMAR, Chicago; CARL M. FREEMAN, Washington; MRS. RUTH R. GODDARD, New York; DAVID GOLDWASSER, Atlanta; ANDREW GOODMAN, New York; ARTHUR N. GREENBERG, Los Angeles; LEWIS S. GROSSMAN, Detroit; EMERY E. KLINEMAN, New York; RAYMOND D. NASHER, Dallas; ALFRED I. SOLTZ, Cleveland ■ BERTRAM H. GOLD, Executive Vice-President

What the Director General did insist upon, however, was having a clear definition from the conference of its expectations with regard to the matter of ensuring an effective Unesco presence in Jerusalem: "I view this presence as follows," he said: "As meaning a relationship with the de facto authorities in Jerusalem. And I do not wish to have criticism later for having legitimized and legalized this facto situation because of this relationship. Let it be understood that the political status of Jerusalem is in no way changed by such an appointment, and in any case, this is not within the competence of Unesco. Finally, what must such a representative be? A witness, a reporter to the Executive Board on what does or does not happen in Jerusalem? Or someone who may influence and act to facilitate certain situations. I cannot remain in ambiguity and the authors of resolution 243 must instruct me."

One might have said that with this Mr. Maheu threw the ball back into the attacking camp. He did not, however, manage to deter the intentions of those who backed resolution 243. They firmly confronted the Israeli delegation with a final question, formulated by the Lebanese representative: "Will you answer, once and for all, yes or no to what we propose." Israel evaded a direct reply, merely stating its disappointment and frustration about the meeting's attitude; defending its position by saying that it was ever ready for political dialogue, but in another forum; and adding that political considerations were not at the root of Minister Avida's (permanent ambassador of Israel Delegation to Unesco) reply to the Director General.

Resolution 243 (enclosed herewith as amended) was voted on: 53 in favor; 8 against; 21 abstentions.

Only Switzerland, the Netherlands, the US, Costa Rica, Brazil and Mexico spoke in defense of the Director General's compromise, though the defeated amendment to this effect was proposed by the Netherlands, Italy, the US, Brazil, Nicaragua, Uruguay and Ecuador. Despite the size of the anti-Israel vote, it should be noted that the West European countries, Canada and New Zealand, by and large abstained; or (as with England) explained away their vote.

The French delegation, however, played a key role in support of the original Arab resolution insisting on Unesco presence, even though getting some attenuation of out and out condemnation of Israel through amendments it proposed, (jointly with Spain) accepted by the Assembly.

Israel will no doubt continue to ignore the Arab request for an official presence of an international body in Jerusalem; and we may expect that the issue will be kept going in forthcoming Unesco general assemblies and meetings, with the same vehemence and with attacks very often going beyond the subject itself and becoming even nasty and personal, as a rather unpleasant one this time with regard to the head of the Israel delegation, Mr. Jacob Bar Yaacov.

cc: Mr. Gold
Dr. Lachman
Mr. Liskofsky
Mr. Resnikoff

Enclosure



General Conference

Seventeenth session, Paris 1972

Draft resolutions and proposals

dr

17 C/DR.243*

3 November 1972

Translated from the French

Item 13.3 of the Agenda

Draft resolution submitted by:

ALGERIA, BAHRAIN, BANGLADESH, ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, IRAQ, JORDAN, KUWAIT, LEBANON, LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC, MOROCCO, SAUDI ARABIA, SUDAN, SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, TUNISIA, OMAN, QATAR, YEMEN, AFGHANISTAN, MONGOLIA, PAKISTAN, CAMEROON, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, GUINEA, MAURITANIA, ALBANIA, MADAGASCAR, CONGO, CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

Amendment to the Draft Programme and Budget for 1973-1974 (document 17 C/5)

Part II - Programme Operations and Services

Chapter 3 - Social Sciences, Humanities and Culture

Sub-Chapter 3.4 - Preservation and presentation of the cultural heritage

The General Conference

1. Aware of the exceptional importance of the cultural property in the Old City of Jerusalem, particularly of the Holy Places, not only to the countries directly concerned but to all humanity, on account of their exceptional cultural, historical and religious value,
2. Recalling once more the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954),
3. Recalling once more Security Council resolutions 250 (1968) of 21 May 1968, 267 (1969) of 3 July 1969 and 298 (1971) of 25 September 1971, and resolutions 2253 and 2254 (4 and 14 July 1967) of the United Nations General Assembly concerning measures and actions affecting the status of the City of Jerusalem,
4. Recalling resolutions 3.342 and 3.343 adopted by the General Conference at its fifteenth session, and Decisions 4.4.2, 4.3.1, 4.3.1, 4.4.1 and 4.3.1 adopted by the Executive Board at its 82nd, 83rd, 88th, 89th and 90th sessions respectively,
5. Recalling particularly paragraph 7 of Decision 4.3.1 of the 88th session of the Executive Board, which invites the Director-General "to ensure the presence of Unesco in the City of Jerusalem with a view to securing an efficient implementation of the resolutions of the General Conference and the Executive Board in this respect",

* This proposal was received by the Secretariat on 2 November 1972

6. Taking note of Decision 4.3.1 adopted by the Executive Board at its 90th session, which observed "that Israel's attitude does not constitute satisfactory response" to the Executive Board Decisions 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 of the 88th and 89th sessions as communicated in the letter of the Director-General dated 18 July 1972 and in which the Board decided "in view of the attitude of Israel...to submit the matter to the General Conference under item 13.3 (17 C/5 sub-chapter 3.4: 'Preservation of Cultural Heritage') with a view to securing an efficient implementation of the resolutions of the General Conference and of the Executive Board in this respect,"

7. Noting that Israel continues to infringe the resolutions adopted in this connexion, an attitude which prevents Unesco from discharging its responsibilities under the terms of its Constitution,"

8. Taking note of the Director General's proposal to provide Israel with an expert which does not seem to be sufficient to ensure Unesco's presence in Jerusalem,

9. Deprecates the continuation by Israel of archaeological excavations in Jerusalem,

10. Urgently calls upon Israel:

- (a) to take the necessary measures for the scrupulous preservation of all sites, buildings and other cultural properties, especially in the Old City of Jerusalem,
- (b) to desist from any alteration of the features of the City of Jerusalem,
- (c) to desist from any archaeological excavations, the transfer of cultural properties and any alteration of their features or their cultural and historical character, particularly with regard to Christian and Islamic religious sites,
- (d) to adhere scrupulously to the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954) and of the above mentioned resolutions,

11. Invites the Director General to continue his efforts to ensure the effective presence of Unesco in the City of Jerusalem and thus to allow of the implementation of the resolutions of the General Conference and the Executive Board in this respect.

12. Invites the Director General to report to the Executive Board at its 92nd session on the implementation of this resolution, so as to enable it, if need be, to consider the necessary measures.

THE JACOB BLAUSTEIN
INSTITUTE FOR
THE ADVANCEMENT
OF HUMAN RIGHTS of THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
165 EAST 56 STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022 • CABLE WISHCOM, NEW YORK • TEL. PLAZA 4000

April 21, 1980

Dr. Amadou M'Bow
Director-General
UNESCO
7, place de Fontenoy
75700 Paris, France

Dear Sir:

I respectfully draw your attention to a mailing that came to me a recently from UNESCO's Regional Headquarters in Bangkok. Enclosed in it was a 222-page brochure including the report of a 1972 conference in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, on "Moslem Doctrine and Human Rights in Islam."

The enclosed xerox copy indicates that the brochure was mailed in a UNESCO envelope postmarked Bangkok, evidently mailed at the expense of UNESCO. There was no explanatory covering letter.

Perhaps you will want to inquire whether this mailing was officially authorized, or sent by an employee on his own initiative, or even by a stranger. If it was authorized, there is the question of why.

These are pertinent questions, I believe, regardless of the content of the brochure.

May I suggest that they are all the more so because the brochure contains some highly questionable passages. For example, pages 54-55 not only seriously distort historical truth but also incite hatred, which violates the UN's human rights prescriptions. And notwithstanding ideology or adherence to any cause, the material on pages 65-71 is similarly offensive. I have enclosed copies of these pages.

I should be grateful for your thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney Liskofsky

SL/jr
enclosures

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Philip E. Hoffman, Chairman • Morris B. Abram • Jordan C. Band • Marton K. Blaustein • Shalom D. Comey • Bertram H. Gold • Robert B. Goldmann • E. Robert Goodkind • Rita E. Hauser • Barbara Blaustein Hirschhorn • David Hirschhorn • Charlotte G. Holstein • Robert S. Jacobs • Richard Maass • Alfred H. Moses • Leo Nevas • Mervin H. Riseman • Arthur E. Roswell • Elizabeth Blaustein Roswell • Jerome J. Shestack • David Sidorsky • John Slawson • Emily W. Sunstein • Gerard Weinstock • Sidney Liskofsky, Program Consultant



P. O. BOX 1425
BANGKOK, THAILAND



PRINTED MATTER

Unesco Regional Office for Education in Asia and Oceania
P. O. BOX 1425
BANGKOK, THAILAND

144. IT: 8-7/RASSA/80

Mr Sidney Liskofsky
The Jacob Blaustein Institute
for the Advancement of Human Rights
of the American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
New York, N.Y. 10022
United States of America

SEA MAIL

UNION POSTALE MONDIALE
Bureau de Paris
15, rue de Drouot, 75009 PARIS
Tél. 01 42 22 53

CONFERENCES

OF RIYAD, PARIS, VATICAN, CITY,
GENEVA, AND STRASBOURG

ON
AMERICAN JEWISH
MOSLEM DOCTRINE
ARCHIVES
AND

HUMAN RIGHTS
IN ISLAM

BETWEEN SAUDI CANONISTS AND
EMINENT EUROPEAN JURISTS AND INTELLECTUALS

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE – RIYAD
&
DAR AL KITAB ALLUBNANI – BEIRUT

of God who was born by a supernatural miracle and glorifies his mother Mary and absolves her from the charges hurled against her by the Jews. Likewise, Islam glorifies Moses and considers him the Prophet sent by God to the people of Israel. Thus, a Christian or a Jewish wife who is concerned on keeping her religion does not find anything to estrange her from her Muslim husband or to expose the family to dispute and disruption. Thus, Islam has no objection to this kind of marriage despite the difference in religion.

- III The marriage of a non-Muslim whether he is a Christian or a Jew for instance, to a Muslim woman has been prohibited by Islam, because a Christian or Jewish husband does not believe in the sanctity of the creed of Mohammad, the Prophet of Islam, and that he is the Messenger of God. As a matter of fact he believes that the Prophet is wrong in his message and his sayings, and this may estrange a Muslim wife from her husband and may expose the family to conflicts and disruption. For this reason, this marriage which ends in such a manner has been forbidden.

11. In connection with point (b) regarding the prohibition of a Muslim to change his religion and which is considered by a man alien to Islam to be also a restriction violating Article (18) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gave every person the right to change his religion and on which the Kingdom also gave its

reservations at the time of the drafting of the Charter, we say that according to the reasoning of Islam this is not a restriction on the freedom of every person to change his religion, but is the outcome of a historical incident. It was established to curb a Jewish conspiracy which was plotted in the early days of Islam when all the Arabs of the city of Al Madinah Al Munawwara united themselves after an armed conflict between them caused by the Jewish refugees. The Jews then craftily thought to let some of them join Islam then renounce it in order to make the Arabs suspect their religion and be misled. A law originated from that incident preventing a Muslim from changing his religion and threatening to penalize him so that nobody could join Islam excepting after making a rational and scientific study of its doctrines ending with his permanent acceptance of the Muslim creed. That was meant to cut off the way for evil men and their like of superficial people, under the threat of punishment, from joining Islam, for the sake of extirpating malicious elements who have been persisting in spreading evil on Earth.

12. It is clear from the reasoning of Islam respecting this point also that it does not spring from the logic of The Restriction of Freedom but rather from the logic of The curbing of the intrigues of the plotters who are addicted to the spread of evil in the world. Thus, this matter is purely an Islamic interpretation — Ijtihad — which is one of the requirements of freedom of opinion. It should not be opposed by a counter-interpretation, for every one has his own interpretation of things, and we have our own interpretation which is supported by

historical facts, and our concern on not letting any one join Islam excepting those who believe in it in a positive and decisive manner. This shows the extent of sacredness attached to the faith which Islam does not allow to be superficial and subject to the misleadings of evil persons.

13. Concerning point (c) as to the failure of the Saudi Kingdom until now to adopt a policy towards labour unions and their absolute rights as provided for in Article (18) of the Universal Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which gave every worker the right not to submit excepting to the laws of his union, forbade the imposition of any restriction on the exercise of such right, and besides, gave the worker the privileged right to go on strike, we would like to say openly that Marxism, which called for this during the nineteenth Century, is the one which is depriving the workers of this right throughout the communist countries today. The communist State does not acknowledge today except its own powers and it chokes every one who threatens to go on strike or to exercise the right to strike. Likewise, the British Labour Government complained in past years of the labour unions and their strikes which were not in the interest of the country. According to their reports, ninety percent of those strikes were in violation of the law. Similarly, the United States of America was in the fore among the States which passed domestic legislations curbing these absolute rights. It issued a statute granting the American President the right to dissolve any labour union if he finds it to be necessary for the security and interest of the country.

14. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, with deep understanding, has given its reservations on this point which combines odd and absolute rights including the right to strike, in order to prevent the interests of the workers themselves, and the interests of the national economy from becoming a tool in the hands of irresponsible subversive foreigners, particularly after issuing the Labour and Social Security Codes in which it included all the international principles laid down for the interest of work and workers. It has included in a special manner the right of equitable pay for performed work, the right of payment for work done on weekends or holidays, the regulation of working hours, the right of getting annual leaves with pays, health and sanitary conditions as well as health security conditions, compensation for industrial accidents estimated on the basis of the degree of disability, the right to be pensioned on reaching the valid retirement age. These labour and social security statutes have placed the Kingdom, in as far as the field of labour rights is concerned, in the fore among developing countries.

15. In addition to that, the Saudi Kingdom is still on the threshold of industrial planning designed to promote economic development which is necessary for furtherance of the prosperity of everyone. Thus, the Kingdom does not want its young and starting industry to suffer from what the British industry is suffering now. The Associated Press Agency reported on August, 26, 1970 A. D. saying: "The industry of Britain is plagued by strikes which are considered the worst ever known during the past sixteen years, and which had their

Religion believes in freedom to own property and in freedom of work for every one. Thus, it provides all the conditions and means for the enjoyment of such rights and guards them against any encroachment, and does not restrict them excepting where public interest is involved.

29. As the enjoyment of economic rights by a citizen is for his welfare, and as his happiness is completely connected with the Economic Development Projects, the Kingdom set up a few years ago a Council to deal with Planning and Development in a general way, and with Economic Development in a particular manner, for it is useless to the citizen to be entitled to the enjoyment of all economic rights if there were no projects to increase economic development, national income and per capita income.

30. The Kingdom, within the bounds of its material revenue, gives great importance to the development of the resources of the country, the exploration of its hidden wealth, the encouragement of industrialization, the reliance on private sector and its support, within the bounds of public interest, without any exploitation and with equitable remuneration for work performed, leaving no room for any class struggles or grudges. It considers the encouragement of individual incentive within these bounds as one of the most important factors to push the wheel of economic development and to safeguard human dignity. It is for the interest of the individual and the well-being of the group.

**THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS
IN OUR REGIONAL COUNTRIES
ARE THE RESULT OF EXTERNAL FACTORS**

31. We regret, at this particular point, in which we ought to explain our own problems that are connected with Human Rights in our Regional Arab Countries that we have to refer to the only basic problem in which Human Rights were exposed to hostile acts. This problem had and will always have the greatest effect on regional and international peace and on the waste of the largest portion of the national and individual resources of more than thirteen Arab countries. This problem has hampered a lot their economic, social and cultural progress since they were seeking to let the groanings of the Arab people of Palestine be heard. The Palestinians were deprived of all their basic rights in their historical Fatherland in which they lived since the times of the Arab Canaanites six thousand years ago and before Israel came to life and resorted to Egypt together with his twelve children where they multiplied for hundreds of years. Then their descendants decided to free themselves from the slavery of the Pharaohs and fled to Palestine. They went there as aggressors and destructive elements in order to establish a homeland for themselves there through conquest against the Arab people who have the sole right to that historical land.

32. If the law of the jungle had dominated the ancient world when the Israelis conquered Palestine after

fleeing from the slavery of the Pharaohs; that barbaric conquest in which the blood of the Arab Canaanites was shed, their lands burned, and their towns destroyed during that period of time as mentioned in the text of the Old Testament, it cannot be permissible in this era, which saw the birth of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of the Human Rights Charter by the United Nations, that conquest, killing, destruction, extermination and wiping out of people who did not submit during early conquest and at the time when the law of the jungle was prevailing, and who will not for a better reason submit during the time of the United Nations Charter, Human Rights and the Universal Charter connected with the implementation of such rights that have never been so badly violated in history by any race as they have been by the Israelis, for one single reason, namely their belief that they are the Chosen People of God and are thus superior to all other peoples; a thing which is unacceptable to anyone at all times. That was the first and the last reason for the persecution which had befallen the Israelis and which will always befall them because it is in complete disagreement with the Rights of Man.

33. Since we referred before to the history of their first and ancient conquest of Arab Palestine, which was taken falsely as a legal justification for their modern conquest and since we pointed out that the Canaanites refused to submit to them, we feel that it is useful to expand a little on the history of that barbaric aggression and the bad consequences it had on world peace at that time when the Canaanites were forced to seek the help of

the Babylonians who rushed to their support, ended the State of Israel and destroyed their Temple for the first time and expelled them from Palestine.

34. When the Babylonian State grew weak and collapsed under the thrashes of the Persian State at that time, the Persians considered those who were the enemies of their enemies as their friends. They restored the Jews and allowed them to rebuild their Temple, but under Persian Rule.

The Arab Canaanites sought anew the help of the Greeks, the enemies of the Persians. To meet their appeal Alexander the Great went to Palestine, destroyed their Temple for the second time and expelled the Jews from there.

35. But when the Greek Empire became weak and fell a prey to the Romans and the Romans entered Palestine, they behaved like the Persians and considered the enemies of their enemies as their friends. They restored the Jews and allowed them to rebuild their Temple for the third time, provided they did it under Roman Rule. But the Arabs did not despair and were able to handle the Romans. Thus, after a while the Romans became aware of the danger of the Israelis and ordered the destruction of their Temple for the third time, until the Muslim Arabs came over and liberated Palestine from the Romans. The Arabs did not find a single Jew there.

36. Thus, we see that the rise of the Israelis in Palestine in the past centuries and the murder of its people upset each time world peace and led to foreign intervention, once on the part of Babylon, then on the part of Persia, then on the part of Athens and finally on the part of Rome. This intervention did not happen at any time except for the interest of a new imperialist empire in this important area of the world, after weakening its Arab inhabitants. Thus, we see that history is repeating itself today due to the Israeli oppression itself, after the Jews were permitted to re-establish Israel and go back to their old aggressive actions. As a result, regional peace has been upset, and had its repercussions on world peace. In Palestine, Human Rights were violated by the Israelis, in a manner unprecedented in the history of mankind. So, can't we draw a lesson from the facts of history?

37. While we thank today the U.N. Human Rights Commission which emphasized to its Special Rapporteur Mr. Janji the necessity of studying the problems connected with the respect of the rights of man and his basic freedoms, their implementation and the implementation of his economic, social, and cultural rights, particularly the regional ones arising from external factors as indicated in paragraph (206) of the debate of the 26th Meeting of the Human Rights Commission, we feel that it is the duty of the Arab countries to give major importance to the sufferings of the Arab people of Palestine whose Human Rights have been violated as a result of aggression by the Israelis who have gathered from all over the world under the guise of return to their historical national homeland,

while in fact this is no more than revival of the old barbaric invasion which took place thousands of years ago, we mentioned before, and which is known in their religions and historical books. They aim at changing the map of this area on the basis of aggression and the elimination of the Arab people of Palestine, which is contrary to Human Rights principles.

38. It is quite strange that the change of the map of this area in favour of an old Israeli aggression and an old form of imperialism is accepted, at a time when the United Nations is liquidating unanimously modern imperialism and aggression since it considers it against Human Rights.

If it is necessary to correct the map of the world on the basis of old conquest, then we would like to ask why the map is not corrected in favour of Old Athens and Old Rome in Europe today also?

ISRAEL'S VIOLATION OF ARAB HUMAN RIGHTS

39. We now present the different aspects of violation of Arab Human Rights in Palestine today as a result of the restoration of the Israeli presence in this Land which has been an Arab Land for thousands of years. We list the following flagrant violations to which we attract

the attention of the U.N. Human Rights Commission:

The creation of Israel in Arab Palestine where the Arabs used to own 96% of the land at the time of the Declaration of the Formation of the State of Israel, and without consulting the opinion of the people of the country respecting self-determination, which is acknowledged by the Universal Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its Article No. 1 in conformity with the terms of the U.N. Charter.

- II Stripping the Palestinian Arabs daily of their property in an oppressive manner and expelling them from Palestine which is in violation of the terms of Article 17 of Human Rights.
- III Prohibiting the remaining Arabs in Palestine of the right of movement and the selection of their places of residence within the State, which is contrary to Article 13 of Human Rights.
- IV Complete seizure by force of all the lands of the Palestinians and their expropriations from their Palestinian owners and the expulsion of Palestinians to live in camps either inside or outside the country, under certain living conditions which aim at the wiping out of these nationalistic Palestinians who are known since the dawn of history. This is in violation of the provisions of "The Special pledge to Prevent Racial

Extermination and Application of Penalties against it" issued in 1948 A.D.

- V Denying the people of Palestine their right in their historical lands and expelling them for replacement with rambles from different citizenships. Besides, committing all sorts of barbaric acts like the killing of aged men and the cutting of the abdomens of women, the slaughter of children and the profanation of the place of worship for their expulsion from their country with the aim of terrorizing them and making them leave their lands in a permanent manner.

This is contrary to all the basic rights of man. As a matter of fact these new invaders are not Israelis, but most of them are Caspians, from the Caspian Sea area who adopted the Jewish faith eleven centuries ago and had no historical connection with Palestine.

40. For all these reasons, we draw the attention of the U.N. Human Rights Commission to this flagrant violation of Human Rights in the Arab Land of Palestine under the observation of the U.N. Organization, and the threat it poses to World peace. This Problem cannot be solved excepting by eliminating its causes which lie in the foreign Isreali conquest, and by restoring the usurped rights of the Arabs who are the owners of the land, or else woe to Human Rights from the Isrealis who believe, like the Nazis, that they are superior to all other races.

NEWS COMMITTEE

FROM THE

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE Institute of Human Relations, 165 E. 56 St., New York, N.Y. 10022, (212) 751-4000

The American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906, is the pioneer human-relations agency in the United States. It protects the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and advances the cause of improved human relations for all people.

MORTON YARMON, Director of Public Relations

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

NEW YORK, August 3 ... The American Jewish Committee has warned community leaders here and abroad against an attempt in the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to deny Israel sovereignty over Jerusalem.

If successful, the Committee asserted, the Arab-initiated scheme "would cast disrepute on the World Heritage Committee as it lends itself to patent political purposes."

According to the AJC, members of the World Heritage Committee have promoted an extraordinary session in September in order to have Jordan nominate the Old City of Jerusalem as part of "the cultural heritage of mankind meriting protection and conservation."

"Because the UNESCO Convention emphasizes that the primary role in identifying and conserving any part of mankind's cultural heritage belongs to the state on whose territory this is located," the AJC stated, "approval of Jordan as a nominee for Jerusalem's Old City is, in effect, to deny that this is Israeli territory."

The entire move, according to the Committee, is contrary to the purposes for which the Convention came into being. Jordan, it stated, is in no position to undertake any preservation or conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem since this is now under effective Israeli jurisdiction and control.

Urging the community leaders to help defeat the proposal, the Committee describes it as "an expensive international farce under UNESCO auspices which can only cast disrepute on the World Heritage Committee as it lends itself to patent political purposes rather than concentrating on its proper task."

- more -

Maynard I. Wishner, President; Howard I. Friedman, Chairman, Board of Governors; Theodore Ellenoff, Chairman, National Executive Council; Robert L. Pelz, Chairman, Board of Trustees.

Bertram H. Gold, Executive Vice President

Washington Office, 818 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 • Europe hq.: 4 Rue de la Bienfaisance, 75008 Paris, France • Israel hq.: 9 Ethiopia St., Jerusalem, 95149, Israel

South America hq.: (temporary office) 165 E. 56 St., New York, N.Y. 10022 • Mexico-Central America hq.: Av. E. National 533, Mexico 5, D.F.

CS&E 1707

Preliminary soundings, the Committee noted, indicate that several non-Arab and Western states on the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, including Australia, which holds a vice-chairmanship, will go along with the Jordanian proposal.

The states currently on the World Heritage Committee that will be voting on the Jordanian nomination are: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Belgium, Cyprus, Egypt, France, West Germany, Guinea, Iraq, Italy, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, and the United States.

Founded in 1906, the American Jewish Committee is this country's pioneer human relations organization. It combats bigotry, protects the civil and religious rights of Jews at home and abroad, and seeks improved human relations for all people everywhere.

81-960-249
7/31/81
A, EJP, REL, FOR, RTV-JL, RTV-R

