

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



COPY  
FOR REFERENCE  
ONLY - DO NOT  
CIRCULATE

THIRD COMMITTEE  
17th meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 19 October 1983  
at 6 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 17th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 82: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 83: SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 86: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 87: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION:

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

(i) Report of the Committee (continued)

(ii) Report of the Secretary-General (continued)

(b) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.3/38/SR.17  
25 October 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 6.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 82: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/106)

AGENDA ITEM 83: SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/371 and A/38/426; A/CONF/119/26)

AGENDA ITEM 86: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/88, A/38/106, A/38/318, A/38/447 and Add.1; A/C.3/38/6)

AGENDA ITEM 87: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: (continued) (A/38/106, A/38/253, A/38/288, A/38/323, A/38/371, A/38/415)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
  - (i) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (continued) (A/38/18)
  - (ii) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/393)
- (b) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/390)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/391)

1. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that one of the Organization's most important tasks was to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and apartheid and to support the struggle of colonial peoples for independence. The United Nations was justly proud of its efforts in that field, reflected in the number of nations which had gained independence in recent years and the progress made in the struggle of peoples still under the yoke of colonialism and racism.

2. His delegation based its appraisal of developments inter alia on General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); its approach differed widely, therefore, from that of the United States delegation which had not supported that resolution.

3. The increasingly authoritative voice of the newly-independent States had been added to that of other peace-loving countries in efforts to avert the threat of nuclear war, halt the arms race and bring about better international relations, based on the elimination of racism and colonialism. But imperialist circles in Western countries, foremost among which was the United States, persisted openly in policies aimed at preserving the outmoded vestiges of colonialism, racism and racial discrimination - an affront to human dignity, one of the most flagrant

/...

(Mr. Ogurtsov, Byelorussian SSR)

violations of basic human rights and a source of untold suffering and of imperialist oppression and exploitation. Those circles sought to establish a network of military bases in newly independent States and to establish so-called rapid deployment forces, resorting to many forms of blackmail, economic blockade and provocation. In some cases, direct military force was applied, or mercenaries were employed. Attempts were made to drive a wedge between groups of African countries and to disrupt their organizations - a policy which aided the racist régime of Pretoria in its armed aggression against sovereign African States.

4. The South African régime's policy of racism and apartheid against the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, and its aggression against Angola and other front-line States seriously threatened those countries' independence as well as international peace and security; the Political Consultative Committee of States Parties to the Warsaw Pact, meeting in January 1983, had rightly concluded, in its Political Declaration, that a final end to all vestiges of colonialism, and rejection of the policy of neo-colonialism, oppression and exploitation of other nations, were essential in order to remove the causes of many conflicts.

5. The United Nations had adopted many important instruments advocating the speedy granting of independence to peoples under colonial domination. One of the most important, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, noted the crisis inherent in the whole colonial system and emphasized that the process of liberation was irresistible and irreversible - a view fully justified by subsequent events.

6. Freedom for colonial peoples was obtained not through the goodwill of their rulers but through struggle, and such struggles had in many cases succeeded as a result of the unswerving support of friendly socialist States. Yet some peoples were still denied self-determination - for example, the people of southern Africa, the Arab people of Palestine and the people of island and other territories - in application of the imperialist principle of "divide and rule". In South Africa, that principle was reflected in the inhuman concept of so-called "separate development" - in other words, apartheid, which the United States representative in the Third Committee had paradoxically sought to defend. It was hard to see anything to commend in a system under which four fifths of the people were automatically consigned, from birth, to the status of prisoners in their own country, were ruthlessly exploited and confined to an area representing only 13 per cent of the country's land, and relegated to "bantustans".

7. That system was applied also by the Pretoria régime in Namibia, which it illegally occupied. The Namibian people's struggle for independence would have succeeded long ago but for the covert and overt military and other assistance provided by the United States and other Western Powers and international monopolies to the racist régime of South Africa, which had led to untold suffering and loss of life for the peoples of southern Africa. It was high time that the illegal occupation of Namibia was ended and power handed to SWAPO, the Namibian people's sole legitimate representative.

/...

(Mr. Ogurtsov, Byelorussian SSR)

8. The supporters of apartheid should heed the terms of the Declaration adopted at the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, particularly the statement that all who contributed to the maintenance of the system of apartheid were accomplices in the perpetuation of that crime. The United States should be the first to take heed; it should likewise observe the call to Governments to develop legislation that would prevent transnational corporations from following practices which assisted the racist régime in Pretoria or exploited the South African and Namibian peoples. The Conference had also reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle waged by the southern African liberation movements and had urged the international community to give moral, political and material support, as a concrete form of international solidarity with all oppressed peoples. The United States refusal to take part in the Conference had reaffirmed its disregard of the call to put an end to apartheid in South Africa, oppression in Namibia and the policy of racist terror waged in the Arab territories occupied by Israel; it had thus shown its true position with regard to questions of human rights. Despite the efforts of certain Western Powers to persuade the international community of their willingness to strive for an end to colonialism and racism in southern Africa, the substantial military assistance provided by a number of those countries, particularly the NATO nations and Israel, to the illegal white minority régime of Pretoria was a cause for particular concern. They maintained close economic ties with that régime, and their firms were active in South Africa; statistics showed that direct foreign investment in that country had amounted to \$US 11 billion at the beginning of 1979 and that total investment had exceeded \$US 45 billion by 1980. According to data provided by the Centre against Apartheid, Western banks had lent over \$US 2.8 billion to Pretoria between 1979 and mid-1982. The International Monetary Fund had granted a loan of \$US 1 billion to South Africa - a transaction condemned by the world community. The Declaration adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence had stated that such assistance boosted the military capability of the Pretoria régime and enabled it to continue the suppression of the Namibian people.

9. The racist régime of South Africa was able, because of the support it received from the United States, to commit the most blatant acts of military aggression against Angola, Zambia, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and other neighbouring States. Similar support enabled the Zionist régime in Israel to frustrate international support for the Arab people of Palestine in its legitimate struggle. In that connection, the United States not only provided support for that régime but indulged in direct aggression in Lebanon, displaying the same bellicose spirit which had prompted its occupation of the Guantánamo base in Cuba. The illegal presence of the United States forces in South Korea in support of the puppet régime in Seoul, prevented the people there from exercising its human rights, including the right to reunification, as proposed by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

10. It should not be overlooked that many so-called small territories and enclaves throughout the world remained under colonial rule. For example, the United Kingdom alone continued to maintain sway over some 30 such territories; a glaring instance

/...

(Mr. Ogurtsov, Byelorussian SSR)

was that country's action in converting in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) into a strategic military base. The administering Powers adduced arguments such as small size of territories and populations, and geographical isolation to justify their continued occupation - as if the inhabitants were prepared to accept perpetual dependence - or sought to justify new forms of colonialism and semi-colonial dependence by terms such as "community", "association" or "integration", in order to keep such territories outside United Nations jurisdiction.

11. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) applied likewise to territories governed by the United States - including the Trust Territory of Micronesia annexed by that country. In 1980 that country had divided the more than 2,100 islands and atolls of Micronesia into four semi-colonial administrative units, to be known as States "freely associated" with the United States - although in fact Washington retained full economic and political control over them. Thus the United States, as the administering Power, had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. Thirty-five years was more than enough time for that Power to have promoted the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence, as called for in the Charter.

12. Puerto Rico, despite the "free association with the United States" proclaimed in 1952, remained a colonial appendage of the United States, which governed Puerto Rico as in the past, subjecting its population to a standard of living below poverty level.

13. In addition, many small islands, deemed to have "special status", were being used by the imperialist Powers as military bases and nuclear-weapon testing grounds.

14. The persistence of vestiges of colonialism was thus no coincidence but the result of the activities of reactionary forces, which sought to avenge earlier setbacks and obstruct the course of freedom and social progress. Such hopes were in vain, however; imperial and colonial rule was a thing of the past.

15. His delegation firmly condemned the imperialist Powers' policy in southern Africa, the Middle East and the small colonial territories, as one of the major obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Western nations should be firmly told to end all assistance to the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel and to comply strictly with the relevant United Nations decisions relating to decolonization and self-determination. His delegation supported the African States' call to the Security Council for firm sanctions against South Africa pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. It hoped that the General Assembly, at its current session, would take decisions in keeping with its resolution 1514 (XV), thus hastening the elimination of the remnants of racism and colonialism throughout the world.

16. With regard to the statement made by the United States representative, it was sad that he should fail to grasp how inappropriate it was for a nation which allied

/...

(Mr. Ogurtsov, Byelorussian SSR)

itself to a régime such as that of South Africa, whose very existence was a blot on civilization, to presume to make slanderous attacks on another country, including distorted interpretations of historical events.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with rule 115 of the rules of procedure, he would call on the representatives who had asked to exercise their right of reply. He reminded members of the terms of rule 115.

18. Mr. SENGO (Mozambique) said that at a previous meeting the representative of Indonesia had claimed that the people of East Timor had already exercised their right to self-determination. The representative of Indonesia had, however, failed to explain when the people of East Timor had voted for integration with Indonesia. She had also failed to mention that on 7 December 1975 Indonesian armed forces had invaded and annexed the territory of East Timor. He wished to remind the representative of Indonesia that the Security Council had unanimously adopted resolutions 384 (1975) and 389 (1976) calling on the Government of Indonesia to withdraw all its forces from the territory of East Timor without delay. The representative of Indonesia should inform the Committee whether those two Security Council resolutions had been implemented.

19. Mr. LOGOGLU (Turkey) recorded his delegation's reservations concerning decision I (XXVII) of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on the Greek Cypriot administration's report; the Turkish Cypriot community had rejected that decision as politically motivated and one-sided, since the report in question took no account of the Turkish Cypriot position, which had been communicated to all members of the Committee in letters dated 25 January and 24 May 1983. The Turkish Government also rejected the decision, which had not, in fact, been adopted by consensus, two committee members having expressed strong reservations (A/38/18, para. 96); and it was inappropriate for the Greek representative to have referred to that matter as the Committee's "only" decision, since the situation had been only one of 36 cases considered. It seemed that CERD had been brought to that essentially political position at the insistence of its Greek Cypriot member, who had abused that Committee's functions in the narrow interests of the community he represented. There could be no reasonable doubt that a problem of racial discrimination existed in Cyprus.

20. His delegation could have agreed with the representatives of Greece and Cyprus had they referred to racial discrimination as the Cyprus problem's basic historical cause. In modern times, especially from 1963 to 1974, Turkish Cypriots had been subjected to cruel forms of racial discrimination by Greek Cypriots. The years of humiliation, oppression and deprivation of fundamental human rights had finally left the Turkish Government no alternative but to fulfil its responsibilities under the relevant international treaties for ensuring the Turkish Cypriots' security. The de facto existence of two separate administrations in Cyprus had been recognized since 1974 by Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, pursuant to the Geneva Declaration of 30 July 1974; and last vestiges of racial discrimination had been eliminated by the population exchange agreement of 2 August 1975, carried out under United Nations supervision. In northern Cyprus there was constitutional

/...

(Mr. Logoglu, Turkey)

order, rule of law, parliamentary government, democratic institutions and respect for human rights; the less than 1,000 Greek Cypriots in that region enjoyed the same rights as the rest of the community, and there had been no single instance of racial discrimination there since 1974. If a problem of racial discrimination did exist in Cyprus, it must be exclusively within the purview of the Greek Cypriot administration, which was thus indifferent to its obligations under the relevant Convention.

21. Discussion of the political aspects of the situation in Cyprus was not on the Third Committee's agenda.

22. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order, said that the Turkish representative should refer to Cyprus by that country's correct name and not speak of a Greek Cypriot administration.

23. Mr. CHEN Shiqiu (China) said that his delegation categorically rejected the deliberate attack against China by the Vietnamese representative. Two points in that attack should be noted. Firstly, the Vietnamese delegation had alleged that China threatened peace in South-East Asia and sought hegemony in the region; but it was Viet Nam which posed such a threat, having violated the sovereignty of neighbouring territory and created a huge refugee problem for other States of the region, by sending large numbers of its troops to install and maintain a régime in Kampuchea. The international community had already made clear its view as to which country threatened peace in the region.

24. Secondly, the Vietnamese representative's attempts to distort the situation even went so far as to question the appropriateness of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the matter. But it was those resolutions which reflected the true situation, revealing Viet Nam as an obdurate aggressor lacking any sincere desire for a peaceful solution. The international community must strive to give effect to those resolutions and to the decisions adopted at the International Conference on Kampuchea; only thus could peace be achieved.

25. Mr. AGUILAR-HECHT (Guatemala) reiterated that Guatemalan territory was not being, and would not be, used for the purpose of military intervention in other States. It was hard, therefore, to understand the assertions which a certain delegation continued to make. Guatemala's commitment was to free dialogue; its Government fully intended that the country should return to democratic rule based on free elections. It did not seek to exercise power by forceful means; it had chosen the path leading to pluralistic democracy.

26. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that the representative of the Kabul régime had sought to divert attention from its acts of oppression and to justify the presence in Afghanistan of over 100,000 foreign troops. The Pakistan delegation utterly rejected his statement.

27. Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Pakistan should refer to Afghanistan by that country's official name.



28. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that the expression he had used was the one widely adopted, since it referred to a puppet dictatorship, maintained only by foreign troops and exercising authority only in a few towns. There were 3 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan alone; his country had accepted them on purely humanitarian grounds. Resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations and the Islamic Conference reflected the international community's firm demand that the foreign occupying forces should withdraw from Afghanistan, that Afghanistan should resume its sovereign, non-aligned status and that the refugees should be allowed to return to their homeland in safety. Afghanistan would do well to heed the international community's demands instead of making abusive allegations against Pakistan, which his delegation again rejected. Pakistan desired only to live in peace and friendship with a free and sovereign Afghanistan; but it would not be deterred from speaking out against the flagrant violations of Afghanistan's sovereignty.

29. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his delegation wished to exercise its right of reply because of certain statements made during the current debate, particularly that of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, concerning paragraph 524 of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/38/18) containing a text relating to the Malvinas Islands. He reiterated that his delegation did not intend to defend or elaborate on the CERD report; but, in view of certain erroneous interpretations of that Committee's mandate in matters of vital importance to Argentina, his delegation stated that it found the text relating to the Malvinas Islands fully justified and opportune, since it accorded exactly with the terms used in relation to other colonial territories mentioned in the same paragraph.

30. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had been greatly disappointed by the statement made by the United States representative in relation to agenda item 86, since it had wondered whether the United States was at last becoming aware of the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights. That country's approach had so far been negative; for example, it had voted against both International Covenants and had not supported General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

31. The United States representative had sought to adduce supposedly intellectual arguments to justify United States policy; but it was wholly incompatible with the principle of self-determination and independence of peoples, being a policy of aggression and domination. The Soviet Union scornfully rejected the falsehoods and attempts to smear it and other socialist countries in their support for self-determination. Likewise, the document circulated by the United States delegation was typical of the hypocritical attacks which it constantly made. The United States representative should bear in mind that the entire Soviet people, consisting of over 100 ethnic groups and nationalities, had stood united in self-defence against Hitlerite aggression, at a cost of some 20 million lives.



(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

32. The essence of the United States policy was, in fact, to replace self-determination by United States determination - as could be seen in places as far afield as Viet Nam, Lebanon, Guantánamo and Central America. Significantly, the United States representative had made no reply to the just criticisms of its record concerning human rights and self-determination. The notion that the United States sought Namibia's full independence was laughable in view of the evidence of massive economic and military support to Namibia's oppressors, the South African régime.

33. With regard to Puerto Rico and the territory of Micronesia, the international community knew the real value of the so-called plebiscites held. In Micronesia, the United States was maintaining its hold, chiefly for military purposes. Kwajalein was suffering the tragic fate of Bikini and Enewetak, for the purpose of providing a springboard for United States aggression in Asia. And it could not be claimed that self-determination was exercised in Puerto Rico, when Puerto Ricans calling for self-determination were being imprisoned.

34. It should be asked why a massive military build-up occurred wherever there was a United States presence, and what justification the United States had for its so-called rapid deployment forces. Likewise noteworthy was the number of Fascist régimes established with United States support in various parts of the world. Until the United States radically changed its imperialistic policy, its attacks against those who truly advocated self-determination and independence would be seen as baseless slander.

35. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had listened with interest to all statements, particularly those of Governments whose policy of appeasement of the racist régime in Pretoria was detrimental to the interests of the people concerned. At no time had his delegation engaged in acrimony or cast aspersions on any Government. It had, therefore, been astonished that the representative of the United States should have made a derogatory reference to Ethiopia and its revolution. It was also unfortunate that the representative of the United States had pointed an accusing finger at two African countries, one of them Ethiopia, in the context of the items under discussion. He wished to assure the representative of the United States that the Ethiopian revolution had been the authentic expression of the will of the Ethiopian people. It was improper that his country's relations with other countries should be the subject of comment in the Committee. He therefore rejected the allegations against his country made by the representative of the United States. The items under discussion were very important to Africa which, more than any other continent, had suffered the brutalities of colonialism, and a significant portion of whose population still suffered the scourge of racial discrimination. His delegation took the Committee's deliberations on the items very seriously, for what was at stake was the freedom and independence of Africans in southern Africa.

36. Mr. KHMEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that in his statement the representative of the United States had made a number of crude attacks against the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and its attitude towards other Soviet

(Mr. Khmel, Ukrainian SSR)

republics. His delegation rejected those attacks as vile slander not in keeping with the facts of history and reality. They were one expression of the public diplomacy being carried out by the United States Administration. More specifically, they were a crusade against communism aimed at discrediting socialism and justifying imperialism. The advocates of that approach attempted to interpret the history of other countries, especially of the socialist countries, by analogy with what was being done by imperialism and its racist, colonialist clients in the Middle East, southern Africa and Central America. It was by such analogies that the United States was attempting to present events in the Ukrainian SSR after the October Revolution. Just as the United States imperialists were currently interfering in the self-determination of peoples under racist and colonial yokes, so after the October Socialist Revolution they had attempted to prevent Ukrainian self-determination. Fourteen States had been united with the United States in an attempt to crush Soviet power. A document had been distributed in the Committee about the Soviet Baltic Republics. He wished to point out that, before the United States had established diplomatic relations with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the Ukrainian SSR had already established links with those Soviet republics.

37. The representative of the United States had repeated fabrications about an alleged famine which was supposed to have occurred in the Ukrainian SSR 50 years previously. In that connection, he wished to point out that the slander had been perpetrated by Ukrainian nationalist bourgeois who had been unable to establish their domination over the Ukrainian people in the 1920s. Those bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists had served Hitler during the Second World War. They had later moved to the United States and, in order to justify their presence in that country had circulated the lie about the famine. In any case, there was famine in the United States. He referred, in that connection, to the Congressional Record for 6 June 1983, according to which Congressman Smith from California had said that domestic famine was one of the most important issues facing the United States.

38. The representative of the United States had made an unjustified use of the word "imperialism". The Ukrainian delegation had already pointed out that the apologists of imperialism were trying to distort the meaning of that word. The Ukrainian delegation defined imperialism as a system of inequality, discriminatory economic relations of dependency and exploitation by the more developed countries and their capital of the people and resources of the less developed countries. Such a system was alien to the socialist countries.

39. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus) said that the representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace had said that the Turkish Cypriots rejected the report and the decision of CERD on the question of Cyprus. But neither the report nor the decision had anything to do with the Turkish Cypriots. When the representative of Cyprus had submitted that country's seventh periodic report (CERD/C/91/Add.16) to CERD, he had been unable to give any information about the Turkish Cypriots because they lived in an area beyond Government control. Also, the criticism levelled against CERD by the representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace was unacceptable because Turkey was not a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of

(Mr. Phedonos-Vadet, Cyprus)

Racial Discrimination. As to the contention that only one Cypriot community had been represented at the CERD meetings, he said that, if and when Turkey became a party to the Convention, it could perhaps suggest that, instead of a representative of the State being sent to present its report, two representatives of two different communities could be sent.

40. The representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace had said that the Greek Cypriot member of CERD had made a groundless complaint about racial discrimination. The definition of racial discrimination appeared in the text of the Convention. Did not the fact that the Greek Cypriot member of CERD was unable to go to his home in Famagusta because he was not a Turk constitute racial discrimination?

41. The representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace had claimed that the Turkish Cypriots were oppressed and humiliated by the Greek Cypriots. That representative had no moral basis for that accusation, since his country's record in the matter of humiliation of conquered peoples was well known.

42. A reference had been made to the so-called Geneva Declaration which, according to the representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace, recognized that there was no Republic of Cyprus, merely two communities. The so-called Geneva Declaration was, however, an illegal document. Cyprus, the main interested party, had not been represented at the meeting at which the Declaration had been adopted. Turkey had ignored the Declaration when it had violated the cease-fire provided for in article 2 by launching a massive attack against the positions of the Cypriot National Guard on 14 August 1974. Turkey should not invoke an agreement, of which it had violated a part.

43. Turkey made frequent references to the so-called population exchange agreement of 1975. That so-called agreement consisted, however, of nothing more than a press communiqué (S/11789) on the Cyprus talks issued in Vienna in August 1975. In paragraph 1 of that communiqué it had been acknowledged that the Turkish Cypriots had the right of movement and settlement anywhere in Cyprus. To claim that the right of movement and settlement anywhere in one's own country was tantamount to a population exchange agreement betrayed Turkey's illegal intentions of expansionism and its aim of bringing about demographic change in the country. By referring to the paragraph on freedom of movement and settlement of the Turkish Cypriots in such a distorted way, the representative of the Turkish Administration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace pretended to be unaware of the fact that the Turkish army of occupation in Cyprus prevented the United Nations from having free and normal access to Greek Cypriot villages and habitations in the occupied areas, in violation of the agreement reflected in paragraph 4 of the press communiqué annexed to document S/11789. The violation by the Turkish army of that point of the agreement was proved in paragraph 31 of document S/15812 of 1 June 1983.

44. Mr. SOERIAATMADJA (Indonesia) said that he wished to remind the representative of Mozambique that the people of East Timor had already exercised their right to

(Mr. Soeriaatmadja, Indonesia)

self-determination in a manner of their own choosing. On 17 July 1976, they had become independent through integration with the Republic of Indonesia in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV).

45. Mr. NGUYEN LUONG (Viet Nam) said that in his statement the representative of China had referred to United Nations resolutions. For the delegation of Viet Nam, the United Nations was a very important international organization which had contributed to progress in the world. However, some of its resolutions and decisions were unjust. Viet Nam had proclaimed its independence in 1945, but it was only in 1977 that it had been recognized by the Organization.

46. The representative of China had said that the delegation of Viet Nam distorted facts. What the Vietnamese delegation had said was that its country supported the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination and opposed the reimposition of genocide on that people. China wanted a return of genocide. As was clear from reports of Amnesty International, genocide had indeed been practised in Kampuchea and the people of Kampuchea did not want a recurrence of that practice. The threat to peace came from China. His country had said that, if that threat was removed, all Vietnamese troops would be withdrawn from Kampuchea. Viet Nam had requested China to conclude with it a non-aggression agreement, but China had refused. Recently, Viet Nam and Kampuchea had reached an agreement whereby each year some Vietnamese troops would be withdrawn from Kampuchea. Viet Nam was in Kampuchea to defend the renaissance of the Kampuchean people and to ensure that there was no recurrence of genocide. Viet Nam was in favour of a dialogue between the countries of South-East Asia with a view to solving all the problems of the region, including that of Kampuchea, but China was unwilling to participate in such dialogue. Viet Nam had no Maoist subversive groups in South-East Asia. China had referred to Viet Nam as an aggressor nation, but the aggressor was China. In January 1979, China had sent 600,000 troops to invade northern Viet Nam. What China wanted was to bleed Viet Nam white.

47. Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan) said that Pakistan's denial of interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was no longer acceptable to the international community. That interference was no longer a secret. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to sections of an article which had appeared in the issue dated 10 October 1983 of Newsweek, a source acceptable to the rulers of the Pakistan military régime. According to that article, to which reference had already been made in the General Assembly by the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (A/38/PV.22), in the Pakistan cities of Peshawar and Islamabad undercover operatives were co-ordinating the flow of money and matériel vital to the rebels across the borders of Afghanistan. Also according to that article, the CIA had stepped up operations within Pakistan to keep tabs on, and props under the pro-American military régime of President Mohammed Zia ul-Haq.

48. Pakistan claimed that it was committed to a peaceful political settlement of the Afghanistan problem on the basis of relevant United Nations resolutions and that it had extended full co-operation to the Secretary-General to that end. That

(Mr. Nabil, Afghanistan)

claim was completely false. Pakistan claimed to be sincere in its wish to negotiate, but it ensured the failure of negotiation by its propagandist campaign in the General Assembly.

49. Turning to the refugee question, he quoted from the relevant portion of the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to the General Assembly (A/38/PV.22, p. 88).

50. He drew the attention of the Committee to the loss of life occurring continuously in Pakistan and to the savage repression exercised by the rulers of Islamabad against their valiant people. The civil disobedience movement launched by the eight-party movement for the restoration of democracy was already in its second month.

51. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, said that the comments of the representative of Afghanistan went beyond the purview of the Committee.

52. Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan), continuing his statement, said that in Pakistan hundreds of protesters against the brutalities of the military dictatorship had been killed or imprisoned. The representative of Pakistan should not try to distract attention from events in Pakistan by waging a propagandist campaign against Afghanistan.

53. Mr. NGO PIN (Democratic Kampuchea) said that the arguments just advanced by the representative of Viet Nam in no way enhanced his country's case. The representatives of Viet Nam would never succeed in their attempt to deceive the Committee. The Vietnamese act of aggression, backed by the expansionist Soviet Union, was a crime which had been condemned and would continue to be condemned until the more than 200,000 Vietnamese troops had been withdrawn from Kampuchea.

54. It was time that the Hanoi authorities understood that they could achieve nothing by force, much less by arrogance, and that they should abandon the law of the jungle and reintegrate themselves into the international community by respecting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and those of the non-aligned countries. In other words, those authorities must implement the United Nations resolutions relating to Kampuchea and the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea.

55. Mrs. ZOGRAFOU (Greece) said that it was astonishing that the representative of a State which, for obvious reasons, had not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination should have the audacity to explain the jurisdiction of CERD. She wished to make it clear that she had spoken of a CERD decision adopted by consensus, not of a unanimous decision.

56. As to the efforts of the Turkish representatives to justify Turkey's invasion of Cyprus and its occupation of part of the Island, she recalled that General Assembly resolution 37/253 had advocated the immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus. Of course, Turkey was free to dissociate itself from the decisions of CERD and the resolutions of the United Nations.

57. Mr. KITTIKHOUN (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that he wished to respond to the statement made by the representative of a certain country in reply to the statement made by the representative of Viet Nam. That representative's allusion to the alleged presence of Vietnamese troops in a neighbouring country merely reflected his disappointment at the fact the Lao people had not yielded to the pressure exerted on them by the authorities of his country.

58. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that it was strange to hear the Ukrainian representative speak of the right to self-determination, since the Ukrainian people were in fact a conquered people and had been conquered after they had established an independent government. A large proportion of their peasantry and élite had subsequently been murdered by means of an artificially induced famine.

59. Furthermore, except for an extremely brief period in the history of the Soviet Union, the great purges that had taken place in the 1930s had not even been acknowledged. The Soviet Union consistently denied reality, as evidenced by its reluctance to report on such matters as plane crashes and the occupation of Afghanistan.

60. The fact that the Soviet Union had ratified the International Conventions on Human Rights was of little significance. The actual implementation of rights was much more important than commitments on paper. A process of genuine self-determination was taking place in Micronesia and Puerto Rico. He wondered why there was no such process in the foreign provinces, independent States, slices of neighbouring countries and other territories that the Soviet Union had annexed after the Second World War. It should be explained why there was no such process in the Ukrainian SSR. The Soviet Union's attitude towards self-determination in general was in fact dictated by the totalitarian dynamic of the Soviet State.

61. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom) said that he wished to reiterate that the right to self-determination applied to the people of the Falkland Islands, just as it did to other peoples. Since his delegation's position on that question was clear, he did not propose to respond to the statement made by the representative of Argentina.

62. However, a number of other delegations had also raised the issue of the Falkland Islands in the context of the right to self-determination, including the delegations of Afghanistan, the Byelorussian SSR, the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and Viet Nam. He was not surprised that those who continued to deny the right to self-determination to the peoples of Afghanistan and Cambodia were prepared to deny it to other peoples as well.

63. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania) said that he felt obliged to stress, in response to the statement made by the representative of Cyprus, that the Albanian population residing in Turkey today lived in friendship with the Turks. Moreover, his country wished to maintain friendly relations with both Greece and Turkey, as well as with the two communities in question in Cyprus.

64. Ms. BROŠNAKOVA (Czechoslovakia), referring to the statement made by the representative of the United States, said that that country was notorious for its countless infringements of the right of peoples to self-determination and for its foreign policy, which had repeatedly violated the Charter of the United Nations. The peoples of Cuba, Micronesia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Palestine, Puerto Rico and Viet Nam had a particular interest in the United States interpretation of the right to self-determination.

65. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that he categorically rejected the allegations made by the representative of Afghanistan.

66. Firstly, with regard to the internal affairs of Pakistan itself, the President had initiated a democratic process that would lead to national elections by March 1985.

67. Secondly, Pakistan had not in any way interfered in Afghanistan's internal affairs. The fact that one third of Afghanistan's population had taken refuge in neighbouring countries was sufficient proof that the resistance of the freedom-loving people of Afghanistan to foreign occupation and repression by the Kabul régime was of a purely indigenous character. That resistance extended throughout Afghanistan. Furthermore, the presence of large numbers of Afghan women and children and elderly Afghans in Pakistan showed how repressive the Kabul régime was.

68. Mr. LOGOGLU (Turkey) noted with dismay that Greece was unwilling to face reality where the situation in Cyprus was concerned and that the Greek attitude towards Turkey remained unchanged. He wished to emphasize that his Government continued to support the endeavour to achieve a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus, through negotiations between the two communities concerned.

69. Mr. SENGO (Mozambique), referring to the statement made by the representative of Indonesia, pointed out that in 1975 and 1976 the Security Council had urged Indonesia to withdraw from East Timor. Furthermore, in a recent statement in plenary meeting the representative of Indonesia had recognized that the Timorese people were still struggling for independence.

70. Mr. CHEN Shiqiu (China) noted, firstly, that the representative of Viet Nam had not said anything new concerning Kampuchea.

71. Secondly, it was entirely untrue that China had invaded Viet Nam in 1979. The Vietnamese authorities were attempting to exaggerate a border incident provoked by Vietnamese troops.

72. Thirdly, in response to the accusation that China had refused to negotiate a non-aggression treaty with Viet Nam, he wished to point out that his Government's position had been set forth in a statement issued in March 1983. It was difficult to understand why Viet Nam refused to accept the reasonable proposals put forward by China and was continuing to try to provoke incidents in the border areas.

/...



(Mr. Chen Shiqiu, China)

73. Fourthly, the representative of Viet Nam had presumably been referring to the "partial withdrawal" of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea, which meant that the overall number of Vietnamese troops present in that country would not be reduced at all.

74. Fifth, Viet Nam was engaging in regional hegemonism and crimes of aggression.

75. Mr. KHARIAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he altogether disagreed with the United States interpretation of the right to self-determination. It must be borne in mind, for example, that the United States had tried to crush the people of the Soviet Union following the revolution. Moreover, there were documents in existence proving that the United States was currently attempting to gain political control over such key regions as the Caribbean, the Mediterranean, South Africa, the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean, including the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, and other regions where there were important raw materials.

76. Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan) said that he sincerely doubted that the Government of Pakistan was concerned about the implementation of the right to self-determination, particularly in view of the number of Pakistanis who were being murdered because they had tried to assert their rights.

77. He also wished to reiterate that Pakistan had promoted subversive activities in Afghanistan that had resulted in great economic and human losses and to refer, in that connection, to the relevant portion of the address by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan to the General Assembly on 6 October 1983 (A/38/PV.21, p. 33).

78. Mr. PHEDENOS-VADET (Cyprus), referring to the statement made by the representative of Turkey, said that a unified Cyprus would remain a dream as long as Turkish expansionist propaganda continued.

79. Mr. NGUYEN LUONG (Viet Nam) said that he wished to emphasize once again that Chinese troops had indeed invaded Vietnamese territory in 1979. He also noted that the Chinese hegemonists, who were not prepared to tolerate "regional hegemony", assuming that such a thing existed, had consistently attempted to negotiate agreements with other Powers at the expense of Viet Nam and Kampuchea.

80. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that the Soviet Union had a convenient way of dealing with matters that it found unpleasant to discuss, in other words, it simply maintained that certain events had never occurred.

81. The Soviet Union had taken over entire nations by destroying their élite and had foisted a totalitarian rule on them from which they could not escape. The Soviet system depended on the use of force, and an attempt was being made to use force elsewhere, outside that system, as a result of the internal dynamic of totalitarianism, which sought to expand. That dynamic was the major source of international tension and the chief threat to peace in the world.

82. Mr. KHMEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he wished to emphasize, in response to the statements made by the representative of the United States, that national self-determination for the Ukrainian people had occurred simultaneously with their social liberation. Furthermore, the social and economic achievements of the Ukrainian SSR spoke for themselves and demonstrated the strength of socialism and its triumph over adverse circumstances.

83. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, said that his delegation was concerned that the question of the Malvinas Islands should be solved in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and would therefore follow the matter with keen interest.

84. Ms. BROSNAKOVA (Czechoslovakia), responding to the statement just made by the representative of the United States, said that the Czechoslovak people had chosen the socialist system voluntarily and were entirely convinced that they had made the right choice.

The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.