

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



THIRD COMMITTEE
21st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 26 October 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand)

CONTENTS

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 (continued)

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

(i) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

UN LIBRARY

UN/SA COLLECTION

*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.21
2 November 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 83: SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/38/L.8 and L.9)

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/C.3/38/L.3 and L.10/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolutions under consideration and suggested that since informal consultations were still taking place, the meeting should be suspended for 20 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that as a result of the informal consultations, it had been agreed that no delegation would explain its vote before the vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9.

3. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that in response to the appeal made during the informal consultations, his delegation would not insist on explaining its vote before the vote but would do so after the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8

4. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 was adopted by consensus.

5. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9 had no financial implications.

Draft Resolution A/C.3/38/L.9

6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the draft resolution had been orally revised by the representative of Senegal at the 18th meeting.

7. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.9 as revised was adopted by consensus.

8. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which the United States, Israel and South Africa had failed to attend, had been the culmination of United Nations activities since the proclamation of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Conference had adopted a Declaration and Programme of Action which clearly showed the links between the Zionists and the racist régime in South Africa. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8, which had just been adopted, requested the international community to resist racism and racial discrimination in all their forms and practices and wherever they existed. His delegation, however, would have preferred more precise wording. Obviously, the Western countries did not wish to

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

see a clear statement in that regard. The African Group, which had sponsored the draft resolution, had stated that the wording, as it stood, would obtain a consensus within the Committee. His delegation would wait to see what the NATO countries, which supported the racist régimes, would do to implement the resolution. The Syrian Arab Republic, even though it believed that the reference to racism should include zionism, had not proposed an amendment to the draft resolution, since it supported the African States and people in their just struggle and was proud of the relations that linked Arabs and Africans.

9. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had readily supported the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9 in a spirit of co-operation with the African Group. His delegation too held the view that what was required was the determined and united efforts of the international community to combat and eliminate all forms of discrimination and oppression of people on grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin. The Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the Second World Conference should serve as a basis in the future fight against colonialism wherever it existed, whether in southern Africa, the Middle East, or the Caribbean. The Programme of Action reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle against racism and colonialism and called for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. The German Democratic Republic would have no difficulty in following the guidelines set forth in the Programme of Action. It remained to be seen, however, whether South Africa's supporters would participate in the struggle against apartheid.

10. Mr. BEIN (Israel) said that when the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had been recommended to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, his delegation, together with others, had supported it unequivocally. For the Israelis, as Jews and human beings, the goals of the Decade had been self-evident. No people in the world had suffered more from racial discrimination than Jews, and most Israelis were either direct or indirect survivors of the Holocaust.

11. Since the inauguration of the first Decade, however, there had been a continuous deterioration and misuse of its declared goals. Positive formulations had been taken out of context, distorted and manipulated to achieve ends nowhere near those intended by the initiators of the resolutions. As had consistently been made clear, Israel totally rejected apartheid. However, the Second World Conference had been a vivid illustration of the blatant manipulation of a world forum to enhance the selfish interests of certain countries, and the Conference had fallen prey to the subversive tactics of Arab extremists and their supporters. The explanation of vote just made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was a perfect example of that. His delegation believed that while some constructive work had been undertaken by the Second World Conference, that work had been undermined for the sake of another unfounded attack upon Israel. Israel had not voted against draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9; however, as a protest against the blatant misuse of positive goals, his delegation would not have participated in the decision had a vote been taken on the two draft resolutions.

/...

12. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that although in 1973 the United States had supported the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, it had not participated in the events of the Decade since 1975 because of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX). Because of its attitude towards the Decade, the United States had not participated in the Second World Conference or in the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and L.9. Had there been a vote on the draft resolutions, his delegation would not have participated. The United States was totally opposed to apartheid and racial discrimination and regretted the politicization of the Decade.

13. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union's approach to the two draft resolutions was determined by its position of principle for the elimination of racism in all its forms and its support of United Nations activities for the full and ultimate eradication of that evil. Accordingly, the Soviet Union attached great importance to draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.5, which had been adopted at the 20th meeting with only the United States voting against it. His delegation hoped that the appeal to States to accede to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid would be heeded.

14. In its statement on agenda item 83, the Soviet Union had noted the importance of the 1973 proclamation of the Decade by the General Assembly in order to step up efforts to eradicate racism and colonialism. It was now common practice in the United Nations to condemn the racists and their protectors. The Second World Conference had reaffirmed the absolute need for further efforts aimed at the earliest possible elimination of racism and racial discrimination. His delegation fully supported the decisions of the Conference and its appeal for the proclamation of a Second Decade. Accordingly, his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8.

15. The existence of racism was an affront to the conscience of mankind and was incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person. His delegation had stated that it would have preferred a more strongly anti-racist wording, but it had taken into account the fact that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 in its final form contained all the minimally necessary elements as could be seen from the second preambular paragraph. For the same reasons, his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.9. The Soviet Union was satisfied with the results of the work of the Second World Conference and was convinced that the efforts of all would succeed in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, zionism in the Middle East and any other form of racism.

16. Mrs. UMANA (Colombia) said that her delegation would have liked to be a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9. It was convinced of the importance of dialogue, which could be effective only when non-offensive language was used. That was the case with draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 and was the reason for the consensus on it.

17. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 and was pleased to have helped to initiate the Second Decade, which, like the first, had begun in a united way. At the Second World Conference, Canada had had to abstain in the decision on the Programme of Action; similarly, it would have abstained if a separate vote had been taken on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8.

18. Mrs. FLOREZ PRIDA (Cuba) said that while her delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 as a tribute to the Africans, she would have preferred to see two essential issues raised in the operative part. First, with respect to the results of the first Decade, it should have been emphasized that while not all goals had been achieved, constructive steps had been taken. Secondly, there should have been some reference to the alliance between Israel and South Africa and the suffering of the Palestinian people, as had been mentioned in the documents of the Second World Conference. Her delegation regretted that the Africans had not accepted that view, but it hoped that all would contribute to measures aimed at eradicating South African racism. Cuba also hoped that those countries which maintained military and trade relations with South Africa would cease to do so and join in the struggle to put an end to that régime. Apartheid in South Africa and racism in the Middle East were similar to racism in the United States, where the black, Indian and Hispanic minorities were the victims of discrimination.

19. Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had associated itself with the consensus, and it assumed that the reference to "the Conference" in paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 referred to the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Racism must be fought in all its aspects, and that included zionism, since zionism was a form of racism.

20. Mr. HADDAWI (Iraq) said his delegation was pleased to associate itself with the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/38/L.8 and A/C.3/38/L.9 by consensus. Iraq was motivated by its traditional policy of support for self-determination and the elimination of racial discrimination. He was convinced that the majority of countries would commit themselves to implementing the resolutions and decisions of the Second World Conference and the Programme of Action. The Committee had heard accusations and distortions made by the representative of the Zionist entity, and his country had been an object of criticism. Among the 105 speakers on racial discrimination and apartheid, however, at least 80 had criticized and condemned the Zionist entity, and that was proof that almost the entire international community condemned it. Zionism regarded as gentiles all but the Jewish people, which called itself the chosen people and sometimes called others "enemies". It was clear that racial discrimination was deeply rooted in the Zionist movement. The so-called oppression of the Jewish people was a device used to deflect attention from the crimes committed daily against the Palestinian people. The Zionist entity was also engaging in and stepping up relations with the Pretoria régime, including military co-operation in the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

21. Mr. MAPALALA (Swaziland) said that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 was of cardinal importance to his delegation. Racism and racial discrimination were indeed uncomfortable concepts which Swaziland had experienced for a long time, being situated next to a country where racism and racial discrimination were still the order of the day, so that, although independent, Swaziland still inhaled the fumes of those evil practices. The proclamation of a further 10-year period as the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (para. 1) and the request made to the Economic and Social Council and to the Secretary-General (paras. 4 and 5) had the full support of his delegation because they were manifestations of the will and determination of Africans and the world at large to deal a blow to that scourge which humiliated other living beings because of the colour of their skin.

22. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 in recognition of the efforts made by a broad range of delegations, particularly the African Group, to re-establish consensus on that important issue. A concerted approach to the elimination of racism and racial discrimination was particularly important because of the importance and universality of the issues. It was in that spirit that the United Kingdom had participated actively and constructively in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference, of the Economic and Social Council and of the Conference itself, as well as in the discussions of the Committee. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 represented an important part of that process. At the same time, the draft resolution contained serious difficulties for his delegation, particularly the references in the eighth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 3 to the documents adopted by the Second World Conference. His delegation's position on certain unacceptable elements in those documents had been made clear at the Conference and in the Conference's report, and its joining in the consensus on the draft resolution did not alter that position. Had there been a separate vote on the last 12 words of the eighth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 3, his delegation would have abstained, and it would also interpret paragraph 4 in that light. It was clear that the United Kingdom's decision to join in the consensus had been based on the conclusion that the overriding objective should be not to prejudice the re-establishment of consensus, in view of the importance of a concerted approach. He expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the fact that consensus had been restored and its hope that the activities of the Second Decade would be governed by that principle and that spirit.

23. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands) said that his delegation was gratified at the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 and that it acknowledged the efforts of the delegations which had made that possible. It especially wished to join in the tribute to Mr. James Jonah in paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.9. The Committee had been successful in attaining the goal of consensus that had narrowly eluded the Conference at Geneva, thus strengthening the fight against racism and racial discrimination.

24. Ms. BANKS (New Zealand) said that New Zealand considered the elimination of racial discrimination to be one of its highest priorities, and it had been glad to join in the consensus. It reaffirmed its support of the objectives of the Second Decade.

25. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation supported the goals of the First Decade and had joined in the consensus to proclaim the Second Decade, in order that the international community might unite its efforts against racism and racial discrimination. His delegation was pleased that consensus had been restored, and the African Group deserved a special tribute for that. The presentation of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 was a constructive step, in spite of the reservations which his delegation had expressed at the Conference. Its position with regard to the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 had been set out in detail in the report of the Conference. He reaffirmed his country's efforts to combat racism and racial discrimination wherever they existed.

26. Mr. AIDARA (Senegal), speaking on behalf of the African Group, thanked all the delegations which had shown their concern for improving the text of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.8 by submitting amendments. He asked those delegations to excuse Senegal and the African Group for deciding not to retain some amendments which, although they were improvements, might have caused problems with respect to the dual objective of making possible the implementation of the Geneva Programme of Action and of achieving consensus. The fact that the draft resolution, and therefore the Programme of Action, had been adopted by consensus was, to the African Group, the most valuable indication that the objectives of the Decade would be implemented.

Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.3

27. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.3 had no financial implications. There was a correction to the French text in the first paragraph on page 2, which was the fifth preambular paragraph: the words "et trente-neuvième" should be added at the end. Malaysia and Costa Rica had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.3 by consensus.

29. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1

30. Mr. AIDARA (Senegal) said that there had been two changes in revision 1. The new paragraph 11 reflected the African Group's concern to bring the draft resolution up to date, and paragraph 30 was completely new.

31. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 had no financial implications.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited those members of the Committee who wished to do so to express their views on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 before a recorded vote was taken.

33. Mrs. ZOGRAFOU (Greece), speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, said that they strongly supported the principle of self-determination but would be unable to support draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1. The United Nations should encourage peaceful solutions to international problems, in accordance with the general principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The Ten did not accept, however, that maintaining relations with a State was equivalent to approval or encouragement of the policies of its Government. The Namibian people must, without further delay, be permitted to exercise its inalienable right of self-determination through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. With regard to Lebanon, she said that the Ten had always supported that country's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and the authority of its Government. They had also stressed the need for the speedy and complete withdrawal of all foreign forces, with the exception of those whose presence was required by the Lebanese Government. A lasting peace in the Middle East could be achieved only if the right of every State in the region to live within secure and recognized boundaries was confirmed and if the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination was also fully recognized. The member States of the European Community found it strange to have a resolution on self-determination which referred to certain particular situations but not to such flagrant and persistent violations as were occurring in Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

34. Mr. MAPALALA (Swaziland) said that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 contained ideas and recommendations which, if implemented, would enhance the principle of self-determination for peoples around the globe. Since events in the world were not static but dynamic, the length of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 did not need to be of concern because it was meant to cover as wide an area as possible, taking into account the current state of affairs in the world; however, he reaffirmed his delegation's difficulty regarding elements on sanctions and said that its position on that point had not changed.

35. Mr. BEIN (Israel) said that it was self-evident that the delegation of Israel would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1. As in previous years, Israel had again been singled out by the initiators of a draft resolution which had no relevance to reality but rather demonstrated the one-sidedness of certain members of the Committee. He asked whether the Committee had already solved the problems of the self-determination of the peoples of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe and the Kurds in Iraq, or the problems of the majority oppressed by minority régimes in various countries, or whether equal civil rights for the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union had been achieved. Those pressing issues had not even been touched by the draft resolutions of the Committee. Rather than dealing with the issues which had been entrusted to it, it was facing once more the dictates of the automatic majority in the United Nations, which was expending all its time and energy in its efforts to malign his country. The efforts of some countries to single out Israel made a farce of the draft resolution. The conscious choice of wording was yet another proof that some of the initiators of the resolution denied Israel, a Member State of the United Nations, the very right of existence as a country. His delegation wished to reaffirm that the Government of Israel totally rejected apartheid, and it flatly denied the repeated fabricated accusations regarding its relations with South Africa.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

36. It was self-evident that although the draft resolution had been presented in the name of the African Group, it had actually been initiated by only some countries of the African Group, countries which were all in the northern part of Africa and who coincidentally also happened to be members of a League - not an African league but the Arab League. Member States of that League not only denied the right of self-determination to the national minorities living in their midsts but wished to deny that right to the State of Israel as well. For years they had been exploiting poverty, famine and the economic, social and cultural hardships which went hand-in-hand with development.

37. Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee was discussing draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 and that if the representative of the Zionist entity had comments, he should concentrate them on the draft resolution instead of attacking sovereign States.

38. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Israel to focus his remarks on the substantive part of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 and also to observe the time-limit for explanations of vote.

39. Mr. BEIN (Israel) said that he would like the Libyan delegation's remark to apply also to the remarks of the representatives of Syria, Iraq and other Arab States. Continuing his statement, he said that those who for years had been abusing the poor and illiterate of Africa merely for their own political ends wished to divert everyone's attention from the true wrongs perpetrated by their own Governments and were now using the draft resolution as an opportunity once again to attack his country.

40. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic) said it was self-evident that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1, whose importance had become all the clearer in the light of the blatant aggression against Grenada by the United States of America. United States representatives had repeatedly tried in the debate to make it seem that their country was a champion of human rights and a fighter for the self-determination of peoples, but recent events proved, if any further proof was needed, what United States policy really meant.

41. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that explanations of vote should not be used as opportunities for launching attacks relating to subjects that were not taken up in the draft resolution. If the representative of the German Democratic Republic wished to open up an entire new area of discussion, he should have done so at another point in the debate. He urged that representatives should exercise restraint.

42. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the United States representative's intervention was surprising, since he had made no attempt to interrupt the representative of Israel. The representative of the German Democratic Republic was explaining the reasons for his vote, and since the barbaric and piratical act of aggression against Grenada on the part of the United States of America came within the scope of the draft resolution, members of the Committee could scarcely fail to mention it.

/...

43. The CHAIRMAN urged the representative of the German Democratic Republic and all representatives explaining their vote - whether before or after the vote - to keep to the substance of the draft resolution before the Committee.

44. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic), continuing his explanation of vote, said that in his opinion the independence of Grenada was a question of self-determination, the subject of draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1. The United States of America had blatantly invaded a young country which was trying to develop its independent path and had blatantly suppressed the will of a small people to be its own master. It had once again used its war machinery to stop historic progress, acting in line with its continued connection with backwardness and reaction and its support for South Africa's policy of apartheid, terror and aggression.

45. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, disagreed with the representative of the Soviet Union. His delegation had been criticized in previous explanations of vote, by the representatives of both the USSR and Cuba but had chosen not to raise a point of order because the atmosphere had been relatively restrained. The present instance, however, was a misuse of the explanation of vote for the purposes of engaging in polemics and opening areas of debate which had been fully explored by the Committee. He appealed to the Chairman to urge representatives to exercise restraint and endeavour in their explanations of vote to concentrate on the draft resolution before the Committee.

46. The CHAIRMAN repeated his appeal to representatives to keep to the substance of the draft resolutions under discussion.

47. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic) said that the United States representative should not distort the discussion. It was United States aggression against Grenada that was abusing the right of self-determination. Continuing his explanation of vote, he said that, in line with its connections with backwardness and reaction, the United States of America was supporting the crimes of the aggressor in the Israeli-occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, was trying to undermine and destroy the revolution in Nicaragua and was planning to deploy new and dangerous missiles in Western Europe. The invasion of Grenada was merely one more expression of the danger resulting from such policies.

48. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that he could not see what the deployment of missiles in Europe had to do with the discussion on self-determination. He appealed to the Chairman to urge the representative of the German Democratic Republic to exercise restraint and stop abusing his privilege.

49. The CHAIRMAN renewed his appeal to the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

50. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic), concluding his explanation of vote, said that the United States invasion of Grenada was another expression of the danger resulting from a policy of super-armament, neglecting the rights of peoples and trampling their aspirations to live in peace.

51. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a point of order raised by Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan), said that, in accordance with the understanding reached earlier, statements in exercise of the right of reply should be made at the end of the meeting.

52. Mr. AIDARA (Senegal), speaking as Chairman of the African Group, reminded members that draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 had been submitted by the African Group as a whole. The subject was one of special interest to the Group, which always submitted a draft resolution on it.

53. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the following correction in the ninth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 18: in the English text the word "alliance" should be replaced by the word "co-operation", and in the Spanish text the word "alianza" should be replaced by the word "cooperación".

54. Mrs. PETER (Bahamas) pointed out that a similar change would have to be made in the tenth preambular paragraph.

55. A recorded vote, having been requested, was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Botswana, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, Portugal, Spain.

56. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 105 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 87: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

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

(i) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (continued) (A/C.3/38/L.6/Rev.1, L.7)

Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.6/Rev.1

57. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the draft resolution had no financial implications. She was not aware of any corrections or additions to the list of sponsors.

58. Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.6/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.7

59. Ms. RADIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that a number of amendments had been received and there were now discussions in progress which she hoped would shortly lead to a text that would be acceptable without a vote. She therefore requested a postponement of discussion on the draft resolution in order to allow the sponsors a little more time.

60. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would agree to a postponement of discussion on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.7.

61. It was so decided.

62. The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a question from Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), said that in accordance with normal procedure, rights of reply could be exercised at the end of the meeting.

63. Following a procedural exchange, in which the CHAIRMAN recalled the understanding in the Committee that explanations of vote given after the voting should be made at the conclusion of the Committee's action on the whole of the relevant group of agenda items, and Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mrs. KOLAROVA (Bulgaria) and Mrs. FLOREZ PRIDA (Cuba) urged that, in view of the importance of the subject, explanations of vote following the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 should take precedence, the CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished the explanations of vote on resolution A/C.3/38/L.10/Rev.1 to be taken at the start of the following meeting.

64. It was so decided.

65. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel in his explanation of vote had spoken of States Members of the United Nations which had participated in the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, had portrayed Israel as the victim of certain countries, claimed that the Jewish people and Israel had been in the vanguard of all struggles against racism, recalled that the Jews had been the victims of nazism and, in general, repeated the old record. The policy consistently pursued by Israel in the United Nations was one of distortion and of discrediting the United Nations - a policy of demagoguery against well-known facts. The Israeli delegation's attacks on all delegations that had the courage to criticize Israel were an attempt to stifle freedom. Israel believed that the most destructive force was the force of passion and emotion, and for more than three decades it had attempted to exploit a feeling of guilt.

66. Mr. BEIN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that the Chairman had asked members of the Committee to show restraint and not to attack other countries. The present statement in exercise of the right of reply was devoted solely to attacking a State Member of the United Nations.

67. The CHAIRMAN repeated his appeal to all delegations for restraint.

68. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), continuing, said that racism and zionism had common features. In principle, there was no difference between Zionist claims about the superiority of the Jewish race as the chosen people of God and nazism's claims about the superiority of the Nazi race. Zionism was based on religion and nazism on lay theories, but they shared the same arrogance. The crimes perpetrated by the Israelis against the Palestinian and Arab peoples and the arrogance of the Israelis forced him to say, without any racism, that zionism was a copy of nazism.

69. Mr. BEIN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, repeated his appeal for members to heed the Chairman's request.

70. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), continuing, said that an institutionalized régime of racial discrimination existed in Israel, based on zionism which aimed at establishing the exclusive Jewish State, in which only Jewish people would have full citizenship. Discrimination in Israel was applied not only to the indigenous Palestinian population but also to Oriental Jews, who were regarded as second-class citizens. He failed to see on what basis the Israeli representative could have the arrogance to say that his country was fighting against racism, in the light of its collusion with the Pretoria régime.

71. Mr. NABIL (Afghanistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the nature of the Zionist entity of Israel was self-explanatory. He resolutely rejected the Israeli representative's allegations concerning his country and wished merely to explain to the Israeli delegation that the Afghan nation had decided its own destiny with irrevocable determination. His people fully enjoyed the right of self-determination, and Israel's slanderous allegations would change nothing. Afghanistan did not need zionist sympathy. The Zionist Israelis, who repeatedly massacred Afghanistan's Muslim brothers both Palestinians and other Arabs, had no right to talk about the right of self-determination of sovereign countries, including the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Afghanistan's right of self-determination was not in danger: Afghanistan was a fully independent country.

72. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was regrettable to hear a pious statement on self-determination by the representative of a Government whose chief symbol in the world today was the Berlin wall, built to prevent its people from fleeing repression and armed with automatically fired guns to kill people simply for trying to escape.

73. With regard to the action taken by the United States of America in conjunction with seven other countries of the Caribbean region, he informed the Committee that a few minutes earlier, in the Security Council, Prime Minister Eugenia Charles of Dominica, Chairperson of the Organization of East Caribbean States, had revealed for the first time that the action undertaken in Grenada by the Organization of East Caribbean States in co-operation with three additional States, including his own, had been requested by the Governor-General of Grenada, whose safety had been secured only in the past few hours. In the absence of governmental authority and the total absence of order after the murder of Prime Minister Bishop and many of his ministers, as well as of other people, including women and children, the Governor-General, as the sole remaining authority, had decided that the action was necessary. It was the stated intention of the Organization of East Caribbean States that once the threat had been removed, they would invite the Governor-General of Grenada to assume executive authority of the country under the provisions of the Grenada Constitution of 1973 and to appoint a broad-based interim Government to administer the country pending elections. As the Prime Minister of Jamaica had said on 25 October, restoration of full democracy in Grenada and the holding of elections were a matter of urgency. It was necessary to restore democracy to a country which had been reduced to violence and anarchy and had been perceived by its neighbours as an imminent threat. The action taken at the request of the Organization of East Caribbean States and the Governor-General of Grenada had been in keeping with international law and the principles of self-determination, as would be demonstrated by the Grenadian people through the use, in free elections, of their right to determine their own future and not have it imposed on them by brutal dictators.

74. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United States had taken the liberty of attacking other delegations and of blatantly spreading lies to defend that country's aggressive policy against the rights of peoples. The United States delegation was trying to teach other delegations how to behave in the Committee in the field of international politics, but it obviously could not stand the truth. The truth was, despite all efforts of the representative of the United States to evade the issue, that the United States had invaded Grenada and trampled the right of self-determination of an independent State.

75. Mrs. FLOREZ PRIDA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was impossible to remain silent when the United States representative tried to justify an invasion perpetrated by his Government's forces against a small, independent, sovereign, non-aligned country which was a member of the United Nations. The massacre in a fraternal country, in which many Cubans, co-operating as construction workers in efforts to fulfil Prime Minister Bishop's dream of building up the country, had died, had been an unjustifiable action, violating the Charter of the United Nations. All the Cuban civilian personnel at the airport and

(Mrs. Florez Prida, Cuba)

in other working areas had died by mid-day. They had not been military personnel, but had carried only light arms supplied to them by Prime Minister Bishop, who had feared a possible invasion of his country. Those deaths could not be justified. The question was now being debated in the Security Council, and she hoped to have an opportunity of condemning in other Committees the invasion of Grenada, which followed many other invasions of Western Hemisphere countries by the United States of America during the past century.

76. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he could not recall having attacked Cuba but felt it necessary to point out that the so-called Cuban construction workers had been defending not Prime Minister Bishop but his murderers.

77. Mrs. FLOREZ PRIDA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that what the representative of the United States had just said was an outright lie and he knew it. The representative of the United States was aware of her delegation's statement on events in Grenada and knew that it deplored the death of Prime Minister Bishop, but her delegation knew that the United States of America was exploiting events. There had been no need of a United States invasion to restore moral authority in Grenada: that was an old pretext. The Cuban construction workers in Grenada had died in the name of internationalism, giving aid to a developing country. The United States invasion had caused the death of many Grenadians and Cubans, and it was her moral duty to reply to the representative of the United States

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.