

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**  
**FORTY-FIRST SESSION**  
*Official Records\**



THIRD COMMITTEE  
55th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 24 November 1986  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. HAMFR (Netherlands)

**CONTENTS**

- AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 97: INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 102: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

\*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 DC2-730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and be 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.3/41/SR.55  
27 November 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

1. Mr. YOLAH (Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs) said that he wished to reply to certain questions raised by the representative of Belgium at a previous meeting regarding the forthcoming expert group meeting on aging to be held in Malta. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/51, the Secretary-General had received a formal request from the Government of Malta to consider Malta as a possible site for a United Nations institute on aging and to undertake a feasibility study on that proposal. Taking into consideration the recommendations of the Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging, in June 1986, the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development had responded to that request and had sent a consultant to undertake the requested study. After reviewing the report of the consultant, and in full consultation with the Government of Malta, it had been decided to convene an intergovernmental expert group meeting to address a number of issues associated with a proposed institute. The recommendations of that meeting would then be brought to the attention of the Commission for Social Development at its thirtieth session.

2. The representative of Belgium had asked: What were the criteria for selecting participating countries? Who was financing the meeting? And what was the proposed institute on aging? First, the selection of countries had been based on geographical distribution and membership in the Commission on Social Development. The experts would be from Eastern and Western Europe, North America, Africa, Asia and Latin America. They were normally not paid for their services; only the travel and subsistence costs of the intergovernmental experts from developing countries were paid from the budget of the meeting. Those criteria were commonly applied to expert group meetings convened by the United Nations to address specific issues.

3. Second, the meeting would be jointly financed by the Government of Malta, the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and the United Nations Trust Fund on Aging.

4. Third, the nature of the proposed institute was precisely one of the questions that would be addressed by the expert group meeting. It would assess what should be the functions of a proposed institute within the context of United Nations activities in that field, as well as its proposed structure, statutes and financial arrangements. The results of the deliberations of the experts would be brought to the attention of the Commission on Social Development at its thirtieth session for consideration and appropriate action.

5. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said the Third Committee should be informed whether the Secretariat understood that, within the concept of the Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging, United Nations activities in that field should be strengthened through optimum use of the Vienna International Centre and the promotion of activities at the national level. His delegation thought that the suggestions put forward by the Secretariat were rather vague and believed that it was premature, in view of the current financial crisis, to suggest the establishment of a new institution.

/...

6. Mr. YOLAH (Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs) said that the institute would probably be financed with extrabudgetary resources. No decision had as yet been made, and there would be none without sufficient information on which to base recommendations to the Social Development Commission.

7. Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the proposed meeting in Malta seemed to be inappropriate. In any event, his delegation wished to know who had been invited because the Federal Republic of Germany would have liked to participate in such a meeting. He wished to know on what basis the invitations had been sent out.

8. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France) supported the statement made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

9. Mr. NAHAS (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the statements made by the representatives of Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany. He wondered whether the proposed meeting was in accordance with General Assembly resolution 40/243, whereby the additional costs of meetings not held at their normal venues should be borne by the host country. His delegation had requested, during the consultations on the consensus resolution (A/C.3/41/L.20/Rev.2) on aging in the Third Committee, that references to institutes on aging be deleted because the Committee had not regarded it as prudent to discuss that particular issue at the moment.

10. Mr. YOLAH (Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs) said that the invitations to the meeting had been limited to members of the Social Development Commission. He had taken note of the statements by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and France and would consult them about their desire to participate in the meeting.

11. Local costs would be borne by the Government of Malta. He would circulate the statement that he had made earlier in order to demonstrate that he had answered all the points raised by the representative of Belgium.

12. The Secretariat was seeking to build up a body of information about the proposed institute through the use of experts. It could then respond to questions from the Government of Malta and would then act on the decisions of the Social Development Commission on the basis of the studies that had been carried out.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/41/3, 180, 183, 189, 213, 274 and Add.1, 315, 317 and Add.1, 326, 337, 343, 354, 398, 461 and Corr.1, 462, 494, 507, 523, 607, 667, 710, 719, 729, 771, 778 and 787; A/C.3/41/1, 3, 6, 10 and 11; A/C.3/41/L.1, L.6, L.18, L.33, L.49, L.57, L.77 and L.79)

13. Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) said that the promotion and protection of human rights was one of the fundamental tasks of the United Nations. Unfortunately, despite the efforts of the international community, virtually all human rights and fundamental

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

freedoms were to a greater or lesser extent infringed in different parts of the world. There was no State that could be fully satisfied with its efforts in that field.

14. South Africa was typical of States that systematically and persistently denied the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The policy of apartheid of the racist régime of Pretoria violated fundamental principles because it denied the intrinsic dignity of the human person and established odious discriminations based on race and skin colour. However, there were other situations which deserved the special attention of the international community and hence the United Nations. In virtually all regions of the world, there were Governments which, under different pretexts, oppressed their peoples and deprived the entire population or specific groups of all or some of their rights and fundamental freedoms. Venezuela believed that civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights were equally necessary for the full development of the human person. They deserved equal protection, even though the real possibilities for the application of each of those categories of rights were different in some cases.

15. Most Latin American countries had democratic Governments and had held authentic elections on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot which guaranteed the free expression of the will of the electorate, in accordance with article 25 (b) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

16. His delegation was convinced that regional action for the promotion and protection of human rights was most appropriate and effective, as demonstrated by the experience in the implementation of the European and Latin American conventions in that field. Such regional efforts complemented those of the United Nations and specialized agencies. Venezuela believed that the established practice of appointing special rapporteurs or representatives to study the situation of human rights in specific countries was most appropriate. The Governments that were the subject of those studies should provide all facilities necessary for the representatives of the Commission on Human Rights and, in particular, all the guarantees necessary for their visits to the country. The Governments of Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala had admitted the respective Special Rapporteurs and Representatives and had co-operated with them in the manner indicated in their respective reports.

17. The Special Representative on the situation of human rights in El Salvador had shown that the situation there had improved and that an important factor was the armed conflict that for some years had seriously affected life there.

18. With respect to the situation in Guatemala, he wished to reiterate the satisfaction of the Government and people of Venezuela at the return to democracy in that fraternal country and the very clear and firm policy of its President in the field of human rights.

19. The information on the situation of human rights in Chile did not permit the same optimism. The power structure and system of Government was not compatible with the obligations established in the international instruments to which Chile

/...

(Mr. Aguilac, Venezuela)

was a party. They were also contrary to the democratic desires of the Chileans. The Committee should draw the attention of the Government of Chile to the concern of the international community at the situation of human rights in that country and should continue to observe developments there.

20. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel) said that, while his Government favoured the restoration of ties with the Soviet Union for the sake of the two and half million Soviet Jews in that country, it deplored the deteriorating situation of those Jews and the intensive campaign being waged against them by the Soviet Government. Fewer Jews were being allowed to leave and, at the present rate of emigration, it would take some 400 years for all of them to leave. The Soviet Government was also waging a campaign to deny all forms of self-expression to the Jewish people. It was being denied its own schools and public theatres, and contacts with Jews abroad and the teaching of Hebrew were prevented. The Jewish religion and culture had been singled out for a kind of persecution that applied to no other minority. The purpose was to destroy the memory of a common past, particularly by measures against the language that was the main vehicle of communicating that past, and by destroying its hope for the future by preventing escape.

21. The new leadership had clearly embraced the past policy of trying to destroy Jewish identity and had accelerated its campaign of persecution against those who wished to leave. Increased repression, however, had only increased the will to resist and the struggle of the Jewish people continued, both in the Soviet Union and outside.

22. No one could be deceived by the new Soviet emigration law, because it was even more restrictive than previous emigration practice and also defied international public opinion. The Soviet Union was violating its own Constitution, as well as international instruments it had signed, including the Helsinki Final Act. People everywhere rightly wondered how the Soviet Union could be trusted to honour any super-Power agreements if it failed to honour the human rights agreements it had ratified. By living up to its own pronouncements and changing its policy towards Soviet Jews, the Soviet Government could contribute to a climate of trust that would lead to an improvement in international relations.

23. Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey) said that the international community had come to realize that tolerance and non-discrimination were essential to the protection of human rights. It had been disturbed to the point of disbelief at the amply documented efforts of the Bulgarian authorities to destroy Bulgaria's Turkish minority. Bulgaria had resorted to such measures as forcing the Turks to adopt Bulgarian names; the arrest, incarceration or deportation of those who resisted; executions of ethnic Turks; banning the use of the Turkish language; a defamatory campaign against Islamic traditions and beliefs; and curtailing the Turkish minority's freedom of movement and communication. The Bulgarian authorities even tried to deny the very existence of a Turkish minority, despite bilateral agreements between Turkey and Bulgaria that explicitly referred to it and despite the existence of bilateral and multilateral legal instruments, not to mention the Bulgarian Constitution, which protected the human rights of minorities, and the Turkish minority in particular.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

24. Turkey had urged Bulgaria to join in bilateral negotiations on all aspects of the question, including immigration to Turkey, but was thwarted by Bulgaria's rigid and unrealistic insistence, contrary to what the rest of the world believed, that there was no Turkish minority in Bulgaria. He hoped that Bulgaria would re-evaluate that position because the need for a settlement was becoming more urgent every day. The international community was now well aware of the full extent of the persecution to which the Turkish minority was still being subjected in Bulgaria, and international human rights bodies were monitoring the situation. Bulgaria should either respect the human rights of its Turkish minority, in accordance with its multilateral and bilateral obligations, or permit the members of that minority to emigrate to Turkey.

25. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that central to all human rights was the right to life. The Reykjavik summit meeting had established irreversible progress in protecting that right through the agreement on the elimination of all nuclear weapons. The agreement reflected the greatly needed new political thinking of the kind symbolized by the joint initiative of the socialist countries to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The establishment of such a system would also require broad co-operation in the humanitarian field because the security of States was inseparable from the struggle to protect human rights, subject to respect for the sovereignty of States, in all areas, and particularly the right to live in freedom and peace.

26. The Soviet Union favoured serious and honest discussions on how human rights could best be implemented and in a manner compatible with the historic practice of various peoples and States, but without the ideological confrontation that could destroy all rights by destroying mankind itself. He regretted that the United States delegation had been trying to introduce a morbid disease, the disinformation virus, into the Committee's work with virulently anti-Communist statements designed to deceive. His delegation denounced efforts to provoke ideological intolerance, hatred and confrontation because they reflected a totalitarian approach and indifference to the protection of human rights and dignity.

27. The "guardians" of human rights wished to deny the importance of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration and the International Covenants. The boycott by the United States of America of the principal international human rights instruments was a scandal, and that country had no right to lecture others about respect for human rights. The United States of America felt that only two rights should be acknowledged - the right to pray to God and to own property. In the civilized twentieth century, that seemed rather minimal. The United States argument that there could be no social, economic or cultural rights was completely frivolous and amoral.

28. Unscrupulous speculation about an individual's right to leave his country was intended to justify a particular economic, political and ideological position. However, there was no mention of the tragic plight of millions of immigrants who, deprived of all rights, found themselves at the very depths of the bourgeois "democracy". The United States of America had a draconian system of entry and exit control, which it used to punish citizens for their progressive-minded beliefs and to harass the victims of dictatorial régimes.

/...

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

29. Socialism and human rights were indivisible. The peoples of the USSR had built their socialist State not in order to achieve world domination, but to free themselves from oppression and enjoy their fundamental rights. The main objective of Soviet society was to implement all of the rights of the individual in practice. In the USSR, there was no inequality or discrimination. There was no persecution on the basis of religion or belief and all denominations, including Muslims and Jews, enjoyed respect and protection from the State.

30. The current process of restructuring and democratization in the USSR was intended to consolidate socialist self-government by the people. Major legislative and administrative measures had been introduced to develop international contacts, particularly in such matters as family reunification and mixed marriages.

31. The USSR supported all the major international instruments on human rights. The twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the International Covenants on Human Rights had been widely observed in the USSR. No State could renounce the Covenants and claim that it recognized only one group of rights. The USSR had offered to host a conference to discuss contacts between people, information, culture and education. The USSR called for business-like co-operation in the humanitarian field, free from hypocrisy and hatred.

32. Mr. EWERLOF (Sweden) said that the reports submitted to the Commission on Human Rights and the work of non-governmental organizations showed that violations of human rights still occurred frequently throughout the world. The report of the Special Rapporteur on torture, covering 33 countries, showed that torture was still widely practised. The situation in Afghanistan, Paraguay, Iraq, Zaire and Turkey gave cause for particular concern.

33. The problem of summary or arbitrary executions remained acute, and many Governments had not responded to requests for information. However, Indonesia should be commended for its co-operation. The question of the abolition of the death penalty should remain on the agenda of the United Nations. It was encouraging to note the response to the enquiries of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, although the number of victims seemed to be increasing.

34. The Commission on Human Rights had recently established a mandate for a Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance. The Baha'i faith was persecuted in several countries, and his delegation was also concerned about disrespect for religious freedom in the USSR, particularly the plight of Soviet Jewry.

35. Citizens of many Eastern European countries could not enjoy their right to leave their own country and to return to it, and the same was true in Viet Nam where, despite the Orderly Departure Programme, many Vietnamese who wished to leave had not been able to do so. In many countries, people who applied for an exit permit were harassed by the authorities or even deprived of their citizenship. The rights of freedom of expression and freedom of association, including the right to form a trade union, were seriously violated in Paraguay, where trade unionists suffered harassment and imprisonment.

(Mr. Ewerlof, Sweden)

36. The Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly had often been accused of being selective in their criticism of countries. A great deal depended on the amount of information available, and the attitude of the countries' neighbours and allies might sometimes stand in the way of adequate consideration of the situation, as had been the case with Uganda and with Kampuchea during the Pol Pot régime. However, the work of the special representatives and rapporteurs was to be commended, and it was regrettable that certain parts of their reports to the General Assembly had not been translated into all official languages.

37. There had been no report on Guatemala in 1986 and, although the situation seemed to have improved since the restoration of a civilian Government, politically motivated violence still continued. The prompt appointment of the Procurator for Human Rights might help to bring about a lasting improvement. Serious human rights violations in El Salvador had continued, owing to the civil war and the shortcomings of the judicial system. It was essential that the two parties to the conflict should establish a dialogue and reach a political solution. The situation of human rights in Chile had not improved, particularly since the declaration of the state of siege on 7 September 1986.

38. It was regrettable that the Government of Afghanistan still refused to co-operate with the Special Rapporteur and that none of his recommendations had been implemented. The lack of co-operation shown by the Government of Iran was also a source of concern. Finally, he could not fail to mention the situation in South Africa, where the most flagrant human rights violations took place. His Government denounced the policies of South Africa, which violated fundamental human rights and threatened international security.

39. Mr. CESTONI (El Salvador) said that El Salvador had changed since the Commission on Human Rights had appointed a special representative to investigate the situation there. Since it had come into power in 1984, the new Government had been implementing a plan to make the conflict more human and to bring peace to the country. The Government's primary objective was to build a genuinely democratic society, with free and open elections. Indeed, the international community had acknowledged the efforts made by El Salvador to achieve peace despite the continued presence of armed factions.

40. Under the Government of President Duarte, human rights were promoted as was an awareness of international and national human rights instruments. Moreover, attempts were being made to punish abuses of power within the Government itself. The Governmental Human Rights Commission was educating all sectors of the population in human rights, particularly the armed forces and the national police.

41. The international community, various organizations and observers agreed with the Special Representative that El Salvador had made great strides in guaranteeing the right to life amid conflicts. Some Governments, however, for political reasons, refused to admit that human rights and fundamental freedoms were indeed respected in El Salvador. In its foreign policy, El Salvador had always observed the principle of non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of another State and peaceful solution of controversies. The Committee's lack of objectivity



(Mr. Cestoni, El Salvador)

and its politically motivated discussions were therefore deeply distressing. In that connection, draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.18 on the situation of human rights in El Salvador was regrettable. The form in which it had been presented did not reflect the ties of friendship and co-operation that some of the sponsors had with El Salvador.

42. Political biases were implicit in a draft resolution which prejudged the situation in El Salvador and, in part contradicted the report of the Special Representative. A negative precedent had been set by not inviting the Salvadorian delegation to participate in negotiations to modify it.

43. The Salvadorian Government was aware that the internal and external causes of its problem must be addressed. Beyond that, however, armed factions in the country must be willing to join in the democratic process. The Government of President Duarte was committed to dialogue and had the backing of the Salvadorian people.

44. In his six reports, the Special Representative, Mr. Ridruejo, had recognized that the human rights situation in El Salvador had steadily improved. It was time to realize that the original circumstances which had necessitated a Special Representative no longer existed. El Salvador therefore requested the Committee to refrain from criticism that was no longer valid and to analyse the situation in the light of the new reality that had set in since 1984. The Government of El Salvador would continue to strengthen its policy of respect for human rights and appealed to other States, and international humanitarian organizations, for their understanding, and their support, in that process.

45. Mr. TSVETIOV (Bulgaria) said that for two years, Turkey had been speaking in various forums on a non-existent problem: the situation of the Bulgarian Muslims. Such misinformation was actually diverting attention from the important human rights problems before the Committee.

46. In the years of discussions and agreements concluded between the two Governments, there had never been any mention of a Turkish minority in Bulgaria. The Treaty of Neuilly (1919) did mention a Muslim minority, but it had no relation whatsoever to the Turkish nation. Such references to an ethnic minority, i.e., descendants of an invader, were profoundly insulting to the Bulgarian people.

47. Turkey's condemnation of Bulgaria was surprising, if not arrogant, considering the war of extermination it had led against the 14 million Kurds living there. Kurds had been forced to adopt Turkish names and to re-name their villages. In fact, anyone who did not bear a Turkish name could be accused of violating national culture and traditions. The same held true for other minorities, such as Arabs, Armenians, Circassians, Georgians and Bulgarians.

48. No less of a paradox was Turkey's demand that Bulgarian Muslims should be allowed to emigrate to Turkey. In the late nineteenth century, ethnic Turks had left Bulgaria, along with Bulgarian Muslims who had had ties to the colonial administration. Much later, in 1968, other Bulgarian nationals had emigrated to

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Turkey to join relatives under a treaty between the two Governments for reuniting separated families. The remaining Muslims in Bulgaria were Bulgarian and did not need Turkey as their religious protector. In Bulgaria, religion was the private affair of every citizen and Muslims were free to practise their faith.

49. Muslim and Turk were not synonymous, and it would be a sad state of affairs if every State claimed the citizens of another State as its national minority simply because they professed the same faith. Turkey would do well to guarantee the rights of its own non-Turkish Muslims who were deprived of the right to speak their native language and who were languishing in prisons. If Bulgaria, on the other hand, was re-naming cities, mountains and rivers, it was only in reaction to Turkish colonial subjugation. Moreover, there was no truth to Turkey's allegation that the Turkish language had been banned in Bulgaria. After all, language did not determine nationality. After centuries of Turkish domination, there remained a few Bulgarians who still spoke the language imposed by the colonists, but they did not constitute an ethnic minority.

50. Turkey's professed desire for détente and international co-operation was hardly displayed by its massive military preparations, its 12-year occupation of Cyprus, and its opposition to a denuclearized zone in the Balkans. The current Turkish Government was cavalierly destroying mutual confidence and good-neighbourliness between its peoples and the Bulgarians. Its destructive line of action was encouraged by foreign Powers interested in destabilizing the Balkan peninsula. That was contrary to the national interests of Turkey and the other Balkan peoples. Bulgaria desired nothing more than co-operation and détente and would continue its efforts to establish constructive relations with Turkey, its neighbour.

51. Miss YOUNG (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of her own Delegation only, said that the European Community countries had complied with the Chairman's appeal for brevity throughout the session. Other delegations, however, had not been so restrained. If those countries thought that sheer repetition would drown out cogent argument, she was sure the Committee was too discerning to be taken in.

Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.77

52. Mr. MENARD (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, said that the sponsors had agreed to amend the first preambular paragraph to read:

" ... the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which, conceived 'as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations' and having provided the basis for the development of the International Covenants on Human Rights, has been ... ".

53. The draft resolution closely followed the text of the corresponding resolution on the observance of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration. In addition, paragraph 2 of the recommendations contained in the annex called for the issuance of updated versions in all official languages of the United Nations publications

(Mr. Menard, Canada)

Human Rights: A Compilation of International Instruments of the United Nations and United Nations Action in the Field of Human Rights. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the financial implications of the draft resolution would be published separately at a later date.

Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79

55. Mrs. DIEGUEZ (Mexico) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79 on behalf of its sponsors. The draft resolution, on measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers, essentially retained the language of previous years. Two preambular paragraphs had been added, stressing how important it was not to suspend the inter-sessional meeting in 1987. That was especially true in view of the progress made with the second reading of the draft convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families. The Working Group must complete its task as soon as possible. It understood that the cancellation of its spring 1986 session had been an exceptional measure. Further financial adjustments should not be made at the expense of the Organization's normal work in the field of human rights. The sponsors hoped that, as in the past, the Committee would adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

56. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79, outlined in document A/C.3/41/L.84.

Rights of reply

57. Mr. KWANG (Observer for the Republic of Korea) said that, at the previous meeting, the representative of Czechoslovakia had made allegations about human rights violations in the Republic of Korea. No country could be entirely free from criticism in the field of human rights: if a society gave more priority to freedom of the individual than to equality of social groups, it would be criticized for not offering equality to all. The representative of Czechoslovakia had sought to distract attention from his country's own human rights record by criticizing others. Amnesty International had reported that the Czechoslovak Government constantly supervised the activities of churches and religious bodies and held many prisoners of conscience.

58. The Republic of Korea was an open society, where problems were problems were freely aired and could therefore be solved, whereas Czechoslovakia was a closed, indeed a totalitarian, society. The representative of Czechoslovakia should devote more attention to his own country's human rights problems and refrain from using the Third Committee to spread political propaganda.

59. Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey) said that the Bulgarian representative's assessment that the Turkish defence effort was not justified by Turkey's defence requirements did not merit consideration in view of Bulgaria's notorious connections with international terrorism and arms smuggling. A more serious contention was that there was no Turkish minority in Bulgaria. Indeed, the large Turkish minority in

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

that country was attested not only by press reports, but also by an Amnesty International report on human rights abuses during the forced assimilation of the ethnic Turkish minority in Bulgaria and by the Bulgarian President himself, who had referred to the Turks as active founders of their socialist fatherland.

60. Moreover, Turkey was interested in the Muslim minority in Bulgaria precisely because it included Turks. That there were minorities in Turkey was not in dispute; anyone who had doubts about their lot was free to come and see for himself. They had every right, if discontented, to go elsewhere. The Turks in Bulgaria could not. Bulgaria's allegations about minorities in Turkey were unfounded. Their sole aim was to create confusion. The 1923 Treaty of Lausanne had recognized that the small religious minorities in Turkey consisted of only non-Muslim groups. In Turkish history there had never been any distinction within the Muslim population. Both Islam and the Turkish culture had been unifying forces in Turkish society. Any attempts to create artificial divisions had been thwarted by the people themselves. Turkey was seeking not confrontation with Bulgaria, but dialogue, and had previously had a very productive relationship with that country. Turkey's attempt to negotiate with Bulgaria had, however, been frustrated by Bulgaria's continued assertion that there was no Turkish minority in Bulgaria.

61. Ms. RACHID DE RACCA (Paraguay), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that her delegation could not accept the Swedish representative's allegations of torture and violations of trade union freedom, based on an Amnesty International report. All due clarifications on such matters had been provided to the Commission on Human Rights; as further proof of Paraguay's co-operation, a Commission expert had recently been there. She was sure that his report would definitively clarify any outstanding points on human rights observance in Paraguay.

62. Mr. ANSELEM (United States of America) said he wondered whether the evil consequences of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), referred to by the Soviet representative, stemmed from the American plan, which was still on the drawing boards, or the Soviet SDI which had been under development for years. The Soviet objection came down to the fear that the American strategy would work, while the Soviet would not.

63. Not only did the Soviet system deny Soviet citizens all civil and political rights; it failed to provide the social and economic rights of which the USSR boasted so loudly. Soviet citizens were faced with sub-standard living conditions, while an elite enjoyed the privileges which they were denied. Their life expectancy was steadily declining. They were not entitled to compensation when their Government mishandled the Chernobyl disaster, nor to leave the country without harassment if unhappy with their lot. If the United States approach to human rights was as negative as the Soviet representative had said, why did people from the Communist bloc, risking all they had including their lives, flee to the United States?

/...

(Mr. Anselem, United States)

64. It was no use citing a list of human rights instruments ratified by the Soviet Union when it was well known that they were not implemented there. It might be asked what the Afghan people thought about Soviet ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

65. The figures on poverty in his country were based on United States standards; if those standards were applied in the Soviet Union, 60 per cent of that country's population would fall below the poverty line. On the question of immigrants, it might be asked why they continued to come to the United States and how many went to the Soviet Union. Americans were free to leave their country and return. Soviet citizens could not do so. It might be asked, on the subject of hunger, why Soviet agricultural production per capita was now lower than under the Czars.

66. He agreed that there should be serious discussion of humanitarian issues; it should take place in the United Nations, in the United States and throughout the world. It should also take place in the closed city of Gorky, where Dr. Sakharov remained in detention for trying to conduct just such a discussion in the Soviet Union.

67. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) objected to the claim by the Soviet representative that there was no anti-Semitism or racism in the USSR and that Soviet Jews were ensured full enjoyment of human rights.

68. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that he wished to know to whom the Israeli representative was replying, since the Soviet representative had not mentioned Israel in his statement.

69. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) replied that he felt entitled to respond as a member of the Jewish religion, to which the Soviet representative had referred.

70. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the Israeli representative was out of order in exercising his right of reply, but that he was free to air his views in the general debate.

71. The CHAIRMAN said that he was sure that the Israeli representative would take note of the Soviet representative's objection, but, since it was often difficult to ascertain why representatives felt moved to exercise their right of reply, he suggested that the right should be interpreted as liberally as possible.

72. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) said that he would reply merely by saying that the words used by the Soviet representative were slogans. If such words were used as yardsticks to measure all the Soviet pronouncements in the Committee, there would be good reason for concern.

73. Mr. DAMM (Chile) said he did not intend to reply to all the diatribes against his country by representatives of countries like Czechoslovakia. They were merely repeating long familiar arguments on instruction from the Soviet Union. When the representative of Czechoslovakia referred to totalitarianism in connection with human rights, however, it would be as well to remember the "Prague spring" and

(Mr. Damm, Chile)

those who were repressed for the crime of wishing to think freely and live in a free and independent country, for they were reminded daily of what totalitarianism meant. Neither terrorist attacks, nor insults, nor falsehoods nor misunderstandings could hinder the clear path that the Chilean people had traced to full democracy.

74. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq), responding to the Swedish representative's references to allegations of torture in Iraq, as contained in the Amnesty International report, pointed out that not all the reports received by that Organization from various quarters were necessarily accurate. His Government had rejected those allegations in detailed official responses sent to Amnesty International. Iraq was entirely willing to co-operate with Amnesty International, whose failure to take into account the Iraqi responses, however, might be an obstacle to ascertaining the truth.

75. He expressed surprise that, whereas the Swedish representative had spoken of selectivity in human rights violations, he had made no mention of one of the most blatant examples of such violations, namely the situation of the Palestinian Arab people in the Arab occupied territories.

76. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States representative, in seeking to justify his reaction to the Soviet statement, had erroneously referred to the Soviet Union's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). It was also incorrect to allege that the Soviet Union had been the first to develop such a defence system, since it was recognized that work on SDI had commenced in the United States of America in the 1960s. The Soviet Union had, moreover, called for the elimination of all such systems in Reykjavik.

77. The United States accusations concerning the human rights situation in the Soviet Union were untrue; his country made maximum efforts to ensure that all citizens enjoyed human rights, irrespective of the amount of money they had in the bank. No one was homeless, jobless or hungry in the Soviet Union, whereas 3 million homeless and 8 million jobless in the United States - to quote United States statistics - were too much for any system. The Soviet Union had responded to allegations of human rights abuses, without deceit, unlike United States propaganda which, promising a golden life, merely masked a situation of crime and unemployment.

78. The Soviet Union did not impose its way of life on anyone. It upheld the international standards to which it had subscribed in human rights instruments. It had not just signed, but ratified those instruments, and was prepared to sit down at the negotiating table to discuss in detail their implementation.

79. Mr. ANSELEM (United States of America), speaking in exercise of his second right of reply, said that the Soviet representative was aware, as all were aware, that there was no reply that could justify the Soviet system of rule, one based on the systematic violation of all basic rights and freedoms. Without its walls and border guards, without its KGB and GRU, without its repeated military interventions

(Mr. Anselem, United States)

against its neighbours, without its relentless campaign against free speech, assembly, religion and free elections and without its network of prisons, labour camps and "mental hospitals", the Soviet system could not survive.

80. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his second right of reply, said that he might remind the United States representative of the number of times that his Government had attacked and suppressed its neighbours, and of the existence of organs of repression in the United States of America, such as its prisons. Rather than indulge in polemics, however, he wished to draw attention to the question of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

81. Mr. DOWEK (Israel), speaking on a point of order, recalled that, out of consideration for the Chairman's appeal, he had more or less relinquished his right of reply, and therefore questioned the Soviet Union's exercise of that right in similar circumstances.

82. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not recognize the right of the Israeli representative to prevent him from taking the floor, since he was replying to the United States representative on the question of human rights in the Soviet Union.

83. Mr. ANSELEM (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, expressed surprise at the Soviet representative's claim to be replying to him, since he had not referred to the Jews in his statement.

84. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in proportion to their numbers, the Jews in the Soviet Union were far better represented in certain professional fields than other sectors of the population. With the thousands of Jews who had been awarded orders and medals of the Soviet Union and the hundreds of books published in Yiddish, for example, there could be no talk of discrimination against the Jews in his country. The United States representative might well look at the situation regarding Jews and anti-Semitism in his own country where, for instance, more than 800,000 Americans of Jewish origin lived below the official poverty line and Jews were barred from numerous clubs and from housing facilities in certain enterprises.

85. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) asked why, if the Jewish contribution to Soviet life was so important, there were only 60 synagogues and 5 rabbis for two and a half million Jews, why the Jews were not permitted to bury their dead according to the Jewish tradition, and why the Soviet Union allowed anti-Semitic books and publications to be published in the official press. The Soviet Union had taken its place among the worst Jewish-haters that existed.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that, although the Soviet representative had previously announced that he had a statement to make, he should be reminded that he had already had two rights of reply.

87. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he objected to a representative being authorized to reply without referring to the person to whom he was replying, as had occurred in the case of the representative of Israel. He did not recognize Israel's right to speak on behalf of the Jews in any country in the world. He now wished to be given the right to reply. Moreover, he had not yet had an opportunity to mention the human rights situation in Israel itself.

88. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Soviet representative had exhausted his right of reply.

AGENDA ITEM 97: INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)  
(A/C.3/41/L.71/Rev.1)

89. Mr. QUINN (Australia) proposed several amendments to the draft resolution. The fifth preambular paragraph should read "proceed with adequate preparation,". Paragraph 1 should be amended to read "in the field of human rights, and urges broad ratification of, or accession to, existing treaties in this field;". Paragraph 3 should be amended to read "Commission on Human Rights, among other appropriate United Nations bodies, in the development of". Paragraph 5 should be amended to read "Requests the Secretary-General to provide appropriate specialized support to United Nations bodies".

90. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

91. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.71/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

92. Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany) explained that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite reservations concerning the fourth preambular paragraph, which he felt was inappropriate because the existing human rights instruments had not yet become universal.

AGENDA ITEM 102: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER: REPORT OF THE  
SECRETARY-GENERAL

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, after consulting a number of delegations, he wished to propose the following draft decision: "The General Assembly, recalling its resolutions 36/136 of 14 December 1981, 37/201 of 18 December 1982, 38/125 of 16 December 1983 and 40/126 of 13 December 1985, decides to defer consideration of the item 'New international humanitarian order' to its forty-second session."

94. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that decision.

95. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.