



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 80th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/35/SR.80
10 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 6.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2, L.66, L.70, L.71/Rev.2)

1. Mr. CABRERA (Spain) said that his delegation unreservedly supported the proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66.
2. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66, regarding it as premature, unacceptable and not in keeping with accepted practice.
3. The proposals contained in the draft resolution would not help the human rights situation in Chile but would hamper the operation of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile. The draft resolution's vague criteria left room for potential misuse. It was not clear where the proposed fund was to be established or who its beneficiaries would be. The attitudes behind the draft resolution had been revealed in a recent article in Newsweek which had stated that some two thirds of the countries of the world were not genuinely free. It was clear that the machinery proposed in the draft resolution would be open to misuse and exploitation for propaganda purposes. It would contravene the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which called for friendly relations between States.
4. His delegation therefore had the most serious doubts with regard to the draft resolution and appealed to the sponsors not to insist on submitting it, at least for the time being. If they had a genuine concern for investigating and combating violations of human rights in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/130, then further discussion was necessary. However, draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66 was not an appropriate means of achieving that end.
5. Miss NAGA (Egypt) said that she had not understood whether the mandate of the Fund, if extended, would apply to victims of human rights violations in South Africa and Palestine. Clarification of that point would help her delegation to determine its position.
6. Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands) said that his country had always supported the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile and was one of the few countries which had made a contribution to it. His delegation supported an extension of the Fund's mandate to cover instances of human rights violations in other countries and was therefore grateful to the Nordic countries for introducing the draft resolution, which it unreservedly supported.
7. Mr. SHESTACK (United States of America) said that the representative of the Soviet Union apparently had not read the draft resolution. It requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of extending the mandate of the Fund, and such a study did not amount to actually extending that mandate. Most countries had confidence in the Commission on Human Rights, so that there should be no difficulty in accepting a study by that body. The Soviet representative's reference to a magazine article was totally irrelevant.

8. Mr. RANGASHARI (India) said that the draft resolution did have some merit but required clarification. For example, if the intention of the sponsors was to establish a fund to benefit victims of human rights violations, it would be preferable to make that fund independent of the Trust Fund for Chile.

9. As a developing country, India also had other, more serious reservations concerning the draft resolution. Paragraph 1 referred to voluntary contributions, while recently there had been attempts to link the question of human rights with that of development. Developed countries had shown increasing reluctance to make contributions for development aims, so that it seemed that the voluntary contributions referred to in paragraph 1 might well be made at the expense of development projects in developing countries. Those countries had requested more help, which had not been forthcoming, and they would not welcome any diversion of the aid they received. Furthermore, the draft resolution did not make it clear whether a separate body, similar to UNDP, would be necessary.

10. It would be preferable for the Committee not to have to take a decision immediately; there would then be time for consultations, so that the aims of the sponsors of the draft resolution and the fears of the developing countries might be reconciled.

11. Miss RASI (Finland) said that questions regarding exactly who would benefit from any new fund were premature. The draft resolution merely requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of extending the mandate of the Trust Fund for Chile. If any new fund was established, it would have a board of trustees and a specific mandate, but that stage had not yet been reached.

12. Miss NAGA (Egypt) said that she had not been satisfied by the remarks of the representative of Finland. She wished to know exactly who would benefit from the establishment of the proposed fund.

13. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that the executive board of the proposed fund would decide how to distribute aid through established channels to victims of human-rights violations. The United Nations had been successful in establishing similar funds in the past, and that experience could be drawn upon for the proposed fund.

14. Mrs. SABATIER (Niger) said that she had not understood whether the aim was to establish a fund to help victims of human-rights violations in general or merely of those occurring in certain specific countries. In the latter case, she wondered whether additional countries would be added from time to time.

15. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that the aim of the proposed fund was to assist victims of human-rights violations who were not covered by other funds.

16. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria) said that she too was uncertain who the beneficiaries of the proposed fund would be.

/...

17. Mr. ROS (Argentina) said that his delegation had serious doubts on the proposals contained in the draft resolution. Any such fund would clearly be open to abuse.

18. Miss NAGA (Egypt) said that her delegation had noted the comments made by the representative of Sweden. However, it was still not clear whether Palestinian victims of human-rights violations would benefit from the proposed extension of the mandate of the Trust Fund for Chile.

19. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that the draft resolution merely requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of extending the mandate of the existing Trust Fund for Chile. The Commission's study would determine the new mandate. The proposal was that all victims of human-rights violations other than those already covered by existing funds should receive benefits. Thus, if the Palestinians were not covered by an existing fund, they would be covered by the proposed fund.

20. Mrs. SANTANDER-DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee), in response to a question posed by the representative of the United Kingdom at an earlier meeting, said that Cyprus, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Sweden and Yugoslavia had contributed a total of \$US 156,250 to the Trust Fund for Chile. Grants of \$US 101,250 had been made, some \$US 24,000 had been disbursed for expenses in connexion with sessions of the Board of Trustees, and \$US 8,800 had been earmarked to finance programme support costs (A/35/543).

21. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that, in considering the draft resolution, the Committee might bear in mind that the proverb he who paid the piper called the tune.

22. The CHAIRMAN asked the sponsors of the draft resolution whether, in view of the opposition expressed, they wished a vote to be taken.

23. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, requested that a vote should be taken.

24. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zambia.

/...

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire.

25. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66 was adopted by 48 votes to 40, with 46 abstentions.

26. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66 for reasons that it had already stated during the discussion of the draft resolution.

27. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation had not contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile because it opposed the selectivity implied by the Fund in providing assistance for the victims of human-rights violations committed in only one country. His delegation supported the long-term objectives of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.66, which aimed at assistance that would be more general and universal in application, and it had therefore voted for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70

28. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had already explained the objectives of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 when it had introduced the draft at an earlier meeting. Since that time, the sponsors had held informal consultations with many interested delegations with a view to working out a text that would be acceptable to all. It had not been possible, however, to accommodate the wishes of all delegations, as some of the amendments suggested would have distorted the objectives of the draft resolution.

29. He announced a number of revisions that had been made in the existing text. The title had been changed to read "Measures to be undertaken against nazist, fascist and neo-fascist activities". In the first preambular paragraph, the word "peoples" in the first line had been deleted and the words "aggression and foreign occupation", had been inserted after the words "nazism and fascism", in the second line. Paragraph 2 of the draft had been significantly amended to read:

/...

(Mr. Schlegel, German Democratic Republic)

"2. Urges all States to give due consideration to implementing the provisions laid down in United Nations General Assembly resolution 2839 (XXVI) in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and especially to take the necessary measures against activities of groups and organizations practising nazist, fascist, neo-fascist or other ideologies based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror;"

Paragraph 3 had been deleted and the previous paragraph 4 had been renumbered as new paragraph 3, but the final part of the paragraph, beginning with the words "and to prohibit ...", had been deleted. Paragraphs 5 and 6 had been deleted and replaced with new paragraphs 4 and 5. The new paragraph 4 read:

"4. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to consider this subject at its thirty-seventh session under the item of its agenda 'Question of measures to be taken against ideologies and practices based on terror or incitement to racial discrimination or any other form of group hatred';"

The new paragraph 5 read:

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session a report in the light of the discussion that would take place in the Commission on Human Rights and on the basis of comments provided by States."

30. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) said that his delegation had already expressed its views on the need for stronger action against nazist, fascist and neo-fascist activities. The increasing manifestations of activities on the part of neo-fascist forces openly proclaiming their ideology in various parts of the world and inexplicably enjoying the indulgence of certain States constituted a serious threat to international peace and security and an obstacle to friendly relations between States and to the promotion of human rights. His delegation therefore fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70, as orally revised by the sponsors.

31. Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands) said that the oral revisions to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 did not fully reflect the extent of the informal consultations between the sponsors and interested delegations. The delegations of Australia, Canada, Greece and the Netherlands had submitted to the Secretariat further amendments to the draft resolution, which were now being processed and would be circulated to all delegations by the end of the meeting.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the fact that he had cancelled the late night meeting, it would perhaps be best to defer consideration of the draft resolution until the sponsors' revised text and the amendments referred to by the representative of the Netherlands were ready.

/...

33. Mr. MAKKI (Oman) suggested that the words "aggression and foreign occupation" should be inserted in the second preambular paragraph after the words "nazism and fascism", just as they had been in the first preambular paragraph.

34. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said it was somewhat ironic that the only delegations that had thus far spoken in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 came from countries which had fought on the Nazi side during the Second World War. His own country had considerable experience in fighting nazism; during a crucial early stage of the war, it had stood alone for more than a year against the forces of nazism at a time when some of the sponsors had in fact been in alliance with nazism. Had his country failed at that time to stand as a bulwark against nazism, the situation today might well be very different.

35. Although there was no serious activity of a Nazi nature in his country, his delegation continued to have some reservations with regard to the draft resolution, even as revised by the sponsors. If it was true, as the representative of the Soviet Union had said at a previous meeting, that the draft resolution was directed primarily against some Western countries, countries that were friends of the United Kingdom and had now established strongly democratic Governments with full observance of human rights, his delegation could not accept such a draft resolution. Furthermore, the draft did not make a strong case for itself; the scattered activities of some insignificant groups of sick individuals could not be seen as a threat to world peace, nor could such activities be seen as justification for preparing reports and further burdening the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights. There were more serious threats facing the world, including in particular the occupation of Afghanistan, and time alone would tell whether other countries might be occupied as well. Moreover, some provisions of the draft resolution contravened the principles of the freedoms of speech and association enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights. His delegation believed that the ballot-box and national debate were much more effective than repression. For all of those reasons, his delegation would not be able to vote for the draft resolution, even as revised, and hoped that changes could be made in the text in order that the draft resolution might be adopted by consensus.

36. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 created difficulties for many delegations. It referred to a specific problem that had no relation to her own country, for one. Although thousands of Moroccans had died fighting against nazism on the fields of Europe during the Second World War, that had been mainly the result of the country's former colonial situation. Morocco had no direct relation with nazism and had no wish to become associated with a conflict out of the past that was of concern only to some countries. In her delegation's view, there were more appropriate forums for raising the matter, such as the current conference at Madrid.

37. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution required States to report on measures that should be taken at the national and international levels to eradicate nazism and similar evils. The paragraph had no bearing on her country, which had no problem with nazism or fascism. Morocco had ratified the International

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Those instruments seemed quite sufficient, and her delegation rejected the imposition of additional unnecessary burdens.

38. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) said it was a well-known historical fact that the forces of nazism and fascism, guided by their racist ideology, had started the Second World War, which had led to great destruction and loss of life. Yugoslavia had never been on the side of nazism and had suffered greatly during the Second World War. One Yugoslav in nine had been killed during that war, and the country's economy had been totally destroyed. Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of the international community, the forces of nazism and fascism had been defeated and peace had been secured in 1945. It should be easy to understand why countries like his own were concerned at the fact that in certain parts of the world there was an increase in the terrorist activities of groups professing nazist, fascist and other racial ideologies. His delegation saw much merit in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 and would support it.

39. Mr. FURTADO (Guinea-Bissau) thanked the representative of the German Democratic Republic for taking account of the opinions expressed by many delegations in the amendments just read out. He was somewhat astonished to hear certain delegations claiming that some of the sponsor countries had been on the side of the Nazis during the Second World War. They should not, however, overlook the courageous activities of the members of the resistance in those same countries, which had greatly contributed to the victory of the freedom-loving countries. It should also be remembered that nazism and fascism were not peculiar to the Hitlerian régime. Fascism had existed in other countries since the end of the Second World War. In particular, those who supported the Fascist South African régime should reflect deeply before casting aspersions on other countries. He was also surprised that a representative of an African country had said that that continent had no experience of nazism and neo-fascism. Yet Africa had seen forms of fascism which were more treacherous than that of Hitler. Countries in every part of the world must be concerned about the spread of nazism, fascism and neo-fascism, which constituted a serious threat not only to world peace but also to the progress achieved by developing countries since their independence.

40. The first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution spoke of the creation of the United Nations and it was well known that the former colonial countries had based their struggle for independence on the ideas enshrined in the Charter.

41. Mr. ERDÖS (Hungary) expressed his delegation's stupefaction at the statement by the representative of a Western country. It was true that Hungary had been on the side of Hitler during the Second World War but the new Hungary, which had been born out of the fight against nazism, would never accept any ideas connected with racial intolerance. It was not necessary to have personal experience of a policy before being opposed to its ideals. For instance, there was no apartheid in Hungary, but all Hungarians were firmly opposed to that policy. Spurious references to past history were unworthy of the Third Committee.

/...

42. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that in former years the Western countries had also proposed amendments to the draft resolutions on the same subject. At the current session, despite the extensive consultations between the sponsors and many delegations, including those of the Western countries, they said that they wished to propose eleven more amendments. Such a large number of amendments, the substance of which could be inferred from those proposed at other sessions of the General Assembly, had certainly not been mentioned during the consultations.

43. During the discussion on the agenda item, many countries had drawn attention to the spread of right-wing groups and neo-fascist organizations, some of which openly claimed that their ideology was based on that of Hitler. Yet the countries which had supported fascist régimes in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa were trying to prove that the activities of such groups were not increasing. The spread of such ideologies not only influenced the political situation inside the country concerned but also had an impact on the international situation as a whole.

44. The resurgence of nazism and fascism had been repeatedly discussed in the General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and most recently at the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

45. The United Kingdom representative had said that implementation of the draft resolution would infringe fundamental principles such as that of freedom of speech. However, adherence to freedom of speech and of assembly should not be used as pretexts for failing to combat fascism and neo-nazism. All States should inform public opinion about the danger of the spread of neo-nazism and fascism and adopt measures to protect young people from such ideologies.

46. His delegation therefore hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution as revised by the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

47. Mr. JANI (Zimbabwe) said that his country had been a victim of racial intolerance and hatred for almost 90 years and its people were strongly opposed to any philosophy based on the superiority of one people over another. He wondered what difference there was between Hitler's nazism and that of the Botha régime in South Africa. It was not surprising that countries which had provided the Ian Smith régime in Zimbabwe with weapons to murder innocent people should belittle the importance of the matter. His country, which was a strict defender of the principle of non-alignment, supported any forces which combated racial discrimination, wherever they might be.

48. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) reminded the representative of the United Kingdom that thousands of citizens of her country, then under colonial rule, had fought against Hitler in the Second World War and many had lost their lives. The matter had been referred to in many international forums and, during the discussion on racial discrimination, the South African régime had been denounced for using the same methods as the Nazis and Fascists before and during the war.

/...

(Mrs. Houngavou, Benin)

She drew attention in particular to the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination annexed to General Assembly resolution 34/24. For all those reasons, her delegation had decided to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

49. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) said that violence against other races propounded by extreme right-wing groups could not be considered normal or harmless, nor could it be claimed that neo-nazism and fascism were myths. Every day, Africans, even those who lived in countries with no racial discrimination, were victims of fascist and neo-fascist ideologies. Apartheid was a form of nazism. The spread of nazi and neo-fascist ideologies must concern the whole world and be combated in the name of those who had died for their principles.

50. Miss VOURAKIS (Greece) said that the people of her country had proved their attachment to freedom and national independence by their opposition to nazism and fascism which had had such tragic consequences during the Second World War.

51. However, since the Netherlands representative had said that several new amendments were being distributed, she suggested that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed until the next meeting, at which her delegation reserved the right to speak again on the matter.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70 until the next meeting.

53. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2

54. Mrs. SANTANDER-DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the delegations of Algeria, Mexico, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia had asked to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

55. Mrs. FLÓREZ PRIDA (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that at the request of some delegations, it had been agreed to delete the words "to El Salvador" from the last preambular paragraph and from paragraph 5.

56. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that, in the light of those two amendments to which his delegation attached great importance, he wished to request that voting on the draft resolution should be postponed until the next meeting.

57. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico) pointed out that the words had been deleted at the request of several delegations, including that of Ireland. Since the sponsors could accept no more amendments, he would prefer the draft resolution to be voted on immediately.

58. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) asked the opinion of the other sponsors and also wondered if other delegations would prefer a postponement.

/...

59. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) expressed her opposition to a postponement of the voting and asked the Chairman to put the proposal by the representative of Ireland to the vote.
60. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that she could see no reason for postponement, since the sponsors had said that they were unable to accept any other amendments.
61. Mrs. FLÓREZ PRIDA (Cuba) said that there had already been extensive consultations on the draft resolution and opinions expressed by other delegations had been taken into account in the two revised versions. She therefore thought that the draft resolution should be voted on immediately.
62. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that the last two amendments were significant enough to influence the voting of various delegations. He therefore supported a postponement, to enable them to seek instructions from their Governments.
63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal by the representative of Ireland, supported by the representative of the United Kingdom, that a vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2) should be postponed until the next meeting.
64. The proposal was rejected by 48 votes to 29, with 36 abstentions.
65. Mr. ROSALES-RIVERA (El Salvador), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that a serious problem of violence existed in El Salvador and was pervading the whole of society. The problem had arisen as a result of an outmoded system of deep social injustice in which opposition groups had not been able to express their views and had consequently sought redress through armed struggle. It was simplistic to view the situation in El Salvador in terms of human rights alone.
66. During the previous year his Government had implemented far-reaching social and economic reforms but had not been able to solve the crisis of violence inherited from the past. Violence could not be justified from any source when alternatives existed in a country where the people were clamouring for peace and rejected violence as a means of achieving social justice.
67. The draft resolution was not objective and contained no rational analysis; it did not therefore represent a constructive approach and could indeed be counterproductive as it could well encourage radical reactions from certain groups by giving indirect support to those who favoured armed struggle as the only form of action. The draft resolution also contained many inaccuracies. His delegation welcomed the moderating role which the Roman Catholic Church had played in promoting a solution based on dialogue and respect for human rights; such an approach was ideally suited to finding an answer to the country's problems. His Government strongly condemned the murder of Monsignor Oscar Arnulfo Romero and was greatly concerned at the attacks on the Church by terrorist groups of the extreme right. It also condemned the murder of the leaders of the Revolutionary Democratic Front; that event had demonstrated the lengths to which extremist groups intent on power and undermining the revolutionary process would go.

(Mr. Rosales-Rivera, El Salvador)

68. His delegation regretted that the draft resolution contained value judgements on events which had not taken place. Moreover it omitted any reference to the fact that the case of El Salvador was being considered by the Organization of American States which, during its tenth General Assembly, had welcomed and accepted the invitation issued by his Government to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to visit his country. Such a visit was scheduled to take place in February 1981. The draft resolution therefore bypassed a regional initiative which should be given priority; it also prejudged a situation which could only be established through proper investigation of the facts. The United Nations should try to find adequate measures for the solution of such a complicated situation. The appeal for a cessation of violence contained in the draft resolution had been submitted in an incomplete context which made no attempt to compensate for the lack of reality which pervaded the remainder of the text. His delegation believed that there should be a broad dialogue between all parties with a view to finding a peaceful solution and national agreement.

69. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. He appealed to all Member States to respect the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the right of the Salvadorian people to decide their own destiny.

70. Mr. CHADERTON MATOS (Venezuela) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2.

71. For many years El Salvador had been governed by an oligarchy and dictators who had exploited the people. During the previous year the new leaders of the country had been struggling to achieve freedom and democracy while from both right and left there had been attempts to impose dictatorship by violent means which continued to threaten the aspirations of the country. Murders by extremists of both the extreme right and the extreme left had proliferated and among the victims had been prominent leaders of the church, political leaders, officials and diplomats. Foreign Powers had intervened for their own strategic purposes.

72. The draft resolution was not sufficiently broad; it failed to take account of all the factors which were involved and assessed the situation incorrectly. It did, however, highlight the need for the United Nations to pronounce on violations of human rights. Physical and psychological pressure on dissidents, internal exile as well as threats from foreign troops contributed to violations of human rights or to the maintenance in power of the existing régime in a number of countries; the United Nations should also consider such situations.

73. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria) said that, while the Committee had been considering draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2, concerning human rights in Bolivia, her delegation had wished to put forward a draft proposal in an effort to find a position of principle so that violations of human rights could be properly examined. Her delegation had been motivated by three considerations. First, it had been clear from the proliferation of draft resolutions that many sponsors

/...

(Miss Obafemi, Nigeria)

had motivations other than human rights in mind. The Committee did not have adequate information on the situation in Bolivia and El Salvador and therefore no documentation on which to base its action. Second, the Commission on Human Rights should be permitted to fulfil its mandate. Third, the Committee should be aware of the full implications of adopting resolutions such as those contained in documents A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2 and A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2. If such draft resolutions were adopted, the Committee would be bound to consider drafts submitted on many other individual countries and would consequently be overloaded. All too often the General Assembly, when it had responded to situations, had done so selectively without due process and balanced treatment. The draft resolutions on Bolivia and El Salvador were cases in point. There were other situations which were equally deserving of attention by the General Assembly, which should approach such situations in a constructive manner. In particular, there must be an information base on which the General Assembly could act. The Committee should consider the adoption of appropriate procedures.

74. Her delegation reserved the right to present its draft proposal in plenary.

75. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that his delegation was gravely concerned with the violations of human rights taking place in El Salvador and in particular with the numerous abductions and murders which continued to take place. A heavy responsibility rested with the military/civilian junta.

76. He welcomed the invitation extended by the Government of El Salvador to the Organization of American States and appealed to the Government of El Salvador to co-operate with the Commission on Human Rights with a view to finding a solution.

77. Miss NAGA (Egypt) regretted that the representative of Nigeria had not been able to present a draft proposal which Egypt had co-sponsored.

78. Egypt condemned all violations of human rights, wherever they might occur. Her Government's position was that any allegation that human rights had been violated by any Member State of the United Nations should be investigated and verified by the Commission on Human Rights which was the appropriate organ and enjoyed a special status in that respect. Her delegation did not approve the selective approach adopted by the Committee which had singled out violations in certain countries while avoiding any reference to violations elsewhere in the world. The verdict of the United Nations should be fair and positive and based on proper investigation of the facts in the country concerned. In the case of Bolivia, the Committee had prejudged the situation; it would have been preferable to await the results of the investigation which the Commission on Human Rights was to carry out in Bolivia in January 1980.

79. Her delegation had abstained in the votes on the draft resolutions on Bolivia and Chile and would not participate in the vote on the draft resolution on El Salvador.

/...

80. Mrs. de REYES (Colombia) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution and reiterated her astonishment that the issue of human rights should be used for political rather than humanitarian ends; such an approach was an insult to the Charter of the United Nations.

81. The draft resolution was discriminatory in character; violations of human rights were taking place even in countries which were co-sponsors. She asked why such concern on human rights had been concentrated on only a few countries. Moreover, allegations had not been supported by investigation. The issue was being considered in the proper regional forum and there was no reason for the United Nations to become involved.

82. Miss ATKINS (United States) said that the United States shared the concern of Member States at the grave violations of human rights which were occurring daily in El Salvador. Her Government would nevertheless vote against the draft resolution, which was unbalanced and did not adequately portray the nature of the struggle taking place in El Salvador; nor did it give an accurate picture of all sources of the violations which were taking place.

83. The Government of El Salvador was faced with extreme violence emanating from both the left and the right. Her Government condemned the assassinations of Archbishop Romero, the rector of the University of San Salvador, members of human rights groups and countless other victims attributed to right-wing violence. It also condemned the abduction and murder of Enrique Alvarez Cordova and five other members of the Revolutionary Democratic Front on 25 November. Her delegation urged that the perpetrators of those murders be promptly apprehended and brought to justice.

84. Her delegation also condemned assassinations attributed to left-wing terrorist groups. On 19 July, a leader of a left-wing guerrilla group had stated publicly in Managua that his organization had been responsible for more than 2,000 casualties during 1980. Subsequently, left-wing opponents of the Government had claimed responsibility for assassinations of civilians, including Melvin Rigoberto Orellana, secretary of the executive committee of the Christian Democratic Party, Manuel Rodríguez, manager of the International Fair, and his wife, as well as for the rocket attack on the city of Santa Ana on 7 November in which eight persons had died. The Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMNL) had claimed responsibility for attacks against civilian targets, such as shopping centres and banks, as well as actions against civilian targets, with its personnel dressed as national guardsmen using Salvadorian army jeeps.

85. Her Government was also profoundly disturbed by reports that elements of the security forces had participated in violations of human rights and called on the Government of El Salvador to take immediate and effective steps to bring those undisciplined members to justice. The Government of El Salvador had taken a number of steps. It had invited international observers from the Inter-American Human Rights Commission to visit the country in order to study the multiple sources of the violence at first hand. It was implementing needed socio-economic reforms to alleviate long-standing injustices. It had announced a time-table for popular elections. On 15 October 1980 it had announced

/...

(Miss Atkins, United States)

an amnesty for all insurgents who wished to lay down their arms and participate peacefully in the political process and several hundred had done so. The Government had unfortunately not been able to bring under control extremists who had rejected appeals to participate in a dialogue or in a democratic political process. On 18 October 1980, the Episcopal Conference of El Salvador had offered to mediate between the Government and its opponents; the Government had accepted the mediation in principle but, on 29 October, the Democratic Revolutionary Front had rejected the mediation offer. The killing, on 25 November, of the Front's leaders had further damaged prospects for mediation and for a peaceful solution.

86. The draft resolution did not refer to the material assistance clandestinely brought into El Salvador from the outside. It was not without significance that two aircraft carrying clandestine shipments of arms had crash-landed in El Salvador in recent months, the most recent being an aircraft reported to be connected with one of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Her Government could not therefore support a recommendation which would deny a Government the right to receive assistance with which to protect the rights and lives of people opposed to the violence of the radical groups at both extremes.

87. Her delegation did not doubt that the General Assembly was competent to consider the human rights situations in El Salvador or any other country. It accordingly looked forward to considering the human rights situations of other countries around the world in future session.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2.

89. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Philippines, United States of America, Uruguay.

/...

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Zaire.

90. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 was adopted by 63 votes to 13, with 48 abstentions.

91. The CHAIRMAN said that when the Committee, early the same afternoon, had been in process of voting on what had then been draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.1, subsequently adopted by the Committee, and had heard three explanations of vote before the vote, there had been a request to make a proposal regarding the draft resolution. On the basis of rule 128 of the rules of procedure, which he had quoted when he had announced the voting process, he had declined the request for a proposal. The Committee had not challenged the ruling of the Chair. The ruling had been upheld because the rules of procedure and, in particular, rule 128, were explicit in that respect. As Chairman, he had assumed full responsibility to provide ample time throughout the day for interested delegations to continue consultations on draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2 and A/C.3/35/71/Rev.2. He had opened the morning meeting and had suspended it to allow time for consultations. The Committee had agreed. He had resumed the meeting about midday and had subsequently adjourned it, also to allow time for consultations to those delegations that were interested in finding some sort of an arrangement. In the afternoon he had declared the meeting open and had suspended it for 20 minutes over the explicit objections of the Committee and had tried to prevail on colleagues by telling them that he had felt the necessity for further consultations for which time was needed. As Chairman, he believed that he had provided more than ample time for consultations. The debate on the draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2 had then taken place and had lasted for almost one hour. If any delegation had wished to make an amendment or introduce a proposal, it should have been able to do so. As Chairman, he had no responsibility to assure whether delegations were present or not.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.