



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 74: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (b) FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (d) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO COLONIAL AND RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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 (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 A-3550, 166 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/35/SR.21
22 October 1980
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/35/371; A/C.3/35/L.3, L.8 and L.10)

AGENDA ITEM 74: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/35/419, A/35/462)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/35/13; A/C.3/35/L.7)
- (b) FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/35/414)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/35/196; A/C.3/35/L.4 and L.9)
- (d) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID (continued) (A/35/197 and Add.1; A/C.3/35/L.5)

AGENDA ITEM 66: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO COLONIAL AND RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (E/CN.4/Sub.2/425 and Corr.1-3 and Add.1-7; A/35/419)

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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 (continued) (A/35/146, A/35/65, A/35/419; A/C.3/35/L.6)

1. Mr. VONGSALY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) welcomed the delegations of Zimbabwe and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines as new Members of the United Nations Organization.

2. Turning to agenda items 66 and 74, he deplored the fact that the Government of South Africa was still practising its policy of apartheid despite the efforts of the international community and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The only way to induce the racist régime in South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States, particularly Angola and Zambia, was to impose global military, political and economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

3. However, some Western countries were continuing and even strengthening their collaboration with the Pretoria régime, as the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had pointed out. His delegation strongly protested against the attitude adopted by those countries, which only encouraged the South African Government to persist in

(Mr. Vongsaly, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

its policy of apartheid, and it would support any proposals or requests for sanctions against South Africa.

4. His delegation condemned equally strongly all acts of racial discrimination committed in other parts of the world, and particularly in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. It would continue to support the struggle of the oppressed peoples for full independence.

5. Since the proclamation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, several peoples and countries, both big and small, had achieved national sovereignty and independence. The twentieth anniversary of the Declaration would provide an opportunity for the Lao People's Democratic Republic to make a resounding affirmation of its attachment to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and to respect for the dignity of the human person and for human rights.

6. Since its establishment, it had striven to eradicate all forms of racial discrimination and to enable all Laotian citizens, who were equal before the law without discrimination on grounds of sex, language, religion or origin, to work together to build a new life for themselves.

7. In conclusion, he said his delegation supported the draft resolution for submission to the Economic and Social Council (A/C.3/35/L.3), in which the Council would decide to hold a second world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination; his delegation would participate in the preparatory work for the conference to the best of its ability.

8. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola) said that Angola had ample qualifications for a speaking out on the practices of racist régimes because of its geo-political situation as a southern African and front-line State, as well as its 500 years of a colonial past and the ideology on which its régime was based, which obliged it to fight racism and racial discrimination wherever they were to be found.

9. Although Zimbabwe's recent accession to freedom and independence was a victory in that fight, racism and racial discrimination were still rife in southern Africa in the particularly brutal form of the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. Not content with depriving the majority of the inhabitants of South Africa of their civil, political and economic rights, it had extended its régime of oppression to Namibia, which it was occupying illegally.

10. The South African régime went further than discriminating against one race in favour of another. It was actually institutionalizing laws and attitudes which deprived thousands of their dignity as citizens, and doing so in their own country, thus causing them a twofold injury.

11. In South Africa, racism took a number of different forms, which included a plan for separate development, the granting of fictitious "independence" which was only a mask for repression and exploitation and the establishment of resettlement areas populated by people who had been uprooted and assigned "homelands" where the unemployment level was so high that, in order to survive, they were forced to

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

accept illegal jobs in the districts reserved for the white population. He wished to draw attention to the condition of the agricultural labourers, which was appalling, characterized as it was by the ever-widening gap between black and white earnings, the basic inequalities of the system of education and training, the refusal to grant legal standing to black trade unions and work committees, and mass arrests of children and adolescents under the terrorism and internal security laws.

12. The situation was even worse in Namibia, where the Pretoria Government was violating every human right of the Namibian people, particularly its right to self-determination, and was depriving it of its fundamental freedoms by occupying Namibia illegally and transforming the territory into a military base, extending the application of martial law, increasing the powers of the police and authorizing the detention and torture of the Namibians arrested at Kararura or kidnapped from refugee camps in Angola.

13. He was underlining the crimes of the racist régimes so as to make the international community understand that programmes of action to combat racism, conferences on the evils of apartheid, the EEC codes of conduct, the international conventions against racism and the declarations of human rights would remain meaningless until ways were found to make a radical change in the situation. A racist régime could not be altered, it had to be destroyed. The apartheid régime could not be changed, it had to be dismantled.

14. However, despite the initiatives of the Security Council, the apartheid régime was still flourishing, with the support of the Western imperialist Powers, which used their veto to prevent the adoption of progressive measures and which applied the concept of human rights selectivity, using it most often as a diplomatic and political tool.

15. The close ties between Israel - which also was applying a racist policy in dispossessing the Palestinian people of its homeland and illegally occupying Arab territories - and South Africa clearly showed that they shared the same racist ideology and the same imperialist interests.

16. The fight to combat racism, racial discrimination and apartheid had to be fought, not only in southern Africa and the Middle East, but also in the parliaments of the Western imperialist Powers and in the executive boards of the transnational corporations.

17. It should not be forgotten that, at that very time, when the Third Committee was discussing the evils of racism, Angola's frontiers were being violated and its territory invaded by South African troops. Angola had taken its case to the Security Council, but in vain, because of the intransigence of the Pretoria Government, which, in order to continue the apartheid system, attacked the front-line States in an attempt to dissuade them from supporting the liberation movements struggling for freedom and majority rule in Namibia and in South Africa. But Angola was determined to fight on until final victory.

18. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), referring to agenda item 75, said that the principle of the right to self-determination had been formulated only at a very late stage and that it had not been until the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) that the international community had undertaken increasingly vigorous action in

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

favour of the accession to independence and freedom of millions of oppressed human beings. At present, that action of the international community was particularly concerned with the Palestinian people and those who were languishing under the yoke of South Africa.

19. Although the right of self-determination had become a dynamic principle, certain countries, for reasons of ideologic or economic interest, did not always defend it with the necessary integrity.

20. The right of self-determination was too often either invoked to justify constant violation of the territorial integrity of a neighbouring country, or deliberately denied to peoples who had been struggling heroically for many years and with little or no response to achieve their freedom and the realization of their legitimate rights.

21. The universal nature of the right of self-determination and the fact that that right should not be exercised to destroy the unity of a nation or obstruct that unity had frequently been referred to in many international instruments and in the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since the signing of the United Nations Charter. In his study of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Mr. Cristescu had noted that the implementation of the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should extend to all the peoples of the world without restriction, not only for the realization but also for the protection of their full and absolute independence since the right of self-determination included the right of people to choose the form of government they wished, to enjoy freely its spiritual and material heritage and not to be subjected to any more powerful nation or people.

22. Despite that recognition of the universality of the right of self-determination, the international community and the international bodies had concerned themselves above all with peoples subjected to colonial and foreign domination. The Committee had been no exception to that rule since, in its consideration of item 75, it had concerned itself only with colonial peoples although it should be engaged in defending the right of self-determination of the peoples of all countries and all territories whatever their nature.

23. Thus, in making a selective and unilateral interpretation of the right of self-determination, the international community shared a major part of the responsibility for the events which had taken place over the past three years: the invasion of African or Asian countries by the troops of neighbouring countries for the sole purpose of imposing a particular régime, the installation of Governments with the support of mercenaries or the overturning of Governments for ideological reasons and their replacement by foreign troops and the devastation of countries by civil war which neighbouring countries, wishing to satisfy their territorial ambitions, encouraged and supported, both morally and materially.

24. At a time when some small countries seemed unable to express themselves freely without interference by more powerful neighbours which claimed to be able to settle

/...

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

their problems and, in the name of the principle of self-determination, committed grave and flagrant violations of human rights, the Committee, like the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, should fully assume its responsibilities.

25. The Committee must condemn, unreservedly and without exception, all foreign military intervention resulting in occupation, all incursions of mercenaries in neighbouring countries in violation of their territorial integrity, and all deliberate attacks against the right of self-determination of the peoples of all countries and territories without exception.

26. In the context of the protection of human rights, of which the most important was the right to true self-determination, the international community must launch and carry out a campaign to promote and protect those rights in an effective manner, notably the inalienable right of peoples to decide freely on their political, economic, social and cultural status without allowing themselves to be influenced by political considerations. That was essential if the international community wished to attain the true goals and objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

27. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.6 on agenda item 75, said that the sponsors had essentially concerned themselves with the humanitarian aspects of the question; it was clear that the denial of human rights often resulted from military intervention and foreign occupation, which, as the international community was aware, created painful refugee problems. The sponsors wished to thank the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for his work on behalf of the refugees.

28. Without wishing to enter into political polemics, although the events in Kampuchea and Afghanistan, to mention only the most recent and typical examples, had had political causes, it might be recalled that the international community had already expressed its position on the questions at issue during the special session of the General Assembly, at the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers and at the thirty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The Committee was concerned with the impact of such situations on the exercise of human rights.

29. The proposed draft resolution reaffirmed the principle of self-determination and referred to resolutions 3 (XXXVI) and 29 (XXXVI) of the Commission on Human Rights. The operative part of the draft resolution was concerned with the humanitarian aspects of the problem, expressed sympathy for the refugees and reaffirmed their right to return voluntarily to their homes. The Commission on Human Rights was requested to continue to give special attention to the violation of the right of self-determination and other human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights resulting from foreign military intervention or occupation. The text of the draft resolution had been carefully worded, and the sponsors

(Mrs. de Barish, Costa Rica)

hoped that all delegations wishing to strengthen the principle of self-determination would vote for it, as it stood, without seeking to weaken it.

30. She requested the delegations of Uruguay and Ecuador to accept her delegation's sponsorship of the amendment in document A/C.3/35/L.1 to add a new paragraph 5 to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4.

31. Mr. GOODEN (Jamaica), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.1, said that the purpose of the draft resolution was to recognize and encourage the efforts made by non-governmental organizations to fight racial discrimination and improve relations between races and communities; the role of such organizations had become even more important with the increase in migration resulting from economic causes.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations who so wished to put questions to the Special Rapporteur.

33. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America), recalling that Mr. Khalifa, the Special Rapporteur, had expressed the wish to update his report and pressed Governments to supply him with all relevant information, said that her delegation wished to know whether the information it had provided in its statement on 26 October 1978 on the economic links between the USSR and South Africa, a matter which had also been referred to in the report of the IMF, had been duly noted, and would be taken into account in a future report.

34. Mr. KHALIFA, Special Rapporteur, said that his report had been prepared in 1978 and that it could not be expected that all the information assembled since that date would appear in it. The list provided in the report was being revised; the new cases reported and the explanations by Governments that had been accused would be taken into account; however, no change would be made on the basis of the statements of a single delegation; changes would be made only in the light of information from a number of countries and organizations. That did not mean that any new country would be added to the list but that new cases could be reported in respect of countries which were on it. A case in point was the co-operation which had developed between the United States and South Africa in respect of coal and petroleum.

35. The list had been drawn up in accordance with the mandate entrusted to the Special Rapporteur in resolution 7 (XXXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights, and although some countries might not be glad to see their companies on the list, and although they might believe that States which had only economic links with South Africa should not be mentioned, it had nevertheless been proved that those links were prejudicial to the exercise of the rights of the African majority, whose only means of enforcing respect for them was to have recourse to violence.

36. Mr. CAHANA (Israel), noting that Mr. Khalifa, in referring to the four or five countries which had economic relations with South Africa, had singled out Israel and,

/...

(Mr. Cahana, Israel)

with regard to military co-operation, had claimed that Israel was co-operating with South Africa in the nuclear field, said he wondered whether Israel owed such special treatment to the fact that it did not belong to either a powerful group or the bloc whose business transactions with South Africa Mr. Khalifa felt obliged to ignore. He also wondered why Mr. Khalifa abused his office to promote prejudice.

37. Israel was complying with the provisions of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), as stated in its letters dated 14 September 1979 and 23 June 1980. Mr. Khalifa had gone further than the report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa (A/35/402), prepared for the Secretary-General by six diplomats and international scientists who, after studying the question of nuclear co-operation with South Africa, had mentioned Israel only briefly, without confirming any of the speculation concerning alleged co-operation by Israel in the nuclear field. It was doubtful whether Mr. Khalifa was better qualified to judge the situation than recognized experts.

37a. Less than 1 per cent of the 1,409 banks and corporations on Mr. Khalifa's list had headquarters in Israel, and they were not, moreover, necessarily large. In addition, according to the annual statistics of the International Monetary Fund concerning trade with South Africa, Israel accounted for only 0.4 per cent of the total.

38. In his bias, Mr. Khalifa resembled those countries which, for reasons of their own, were seeking to exploit the general indignation over South Africa's policies in order to paint a false picture of Israel's relations with South Africa. One would have expected an "independent" expert to show the moral and intellectual integrity referred to in Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter.

38a. He wondered why Israel, which was often in the minority in the United Nations, was thus the victim of discrimination. In view of the recent wave of violent anti-Jewish acts, it was well to recall the dangerous effects of spreading false or selective information and, while Mr. Khalifa was not to be suspected of wishing to do so, he should be more careful in future.

39. Mr. KHALIFA, Special Rapporteur, observing that Israel's accusations related to an outdated report which was no longer under discussion, recalled that a Special Rapporteur was, according to his terms of reference, neither an international civil servant nor a representative of his Government, and that he must carry out his task in full independence and in accordance with his conscience, avoiding bias at all costs, which would discredit him in the eyes of the entire world. He had therefore carried out his functions in complete independence vis-à-vis his own Government and vis-à-vis the Eastern and Western blocs. It was not possible, however, for a conscientious rapporteur to ignore the voluminous documentation published by the United Nations with regard to the situation in Palestine, or the resolutions condemning Israel, or the reports dealing with Israel's very special links with South Africa.

40. He invited the representative of Israel to test his moral integrity by providing information on the relations which allegedly existed between other States, in particular the Arab States, and South Africa.

/...

41. Mr. ABDUL-AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that it was regrettable that States which maintained relations with South Africa were seeking to challenge the truth of the facts presented in the report of the Special Rapporteur, instead of being honest. Those States would do better to respect the humanitarian principles on which they had based their revolution. The African countries knew all too well what racism was. His delegation urged those States to adopt positive measures and recognize the facts, and he assured the Special Rapporteur of his confidence in his integrity.

42. Mr. HAMOUD (Iraq) thanked the Special Rapporteur for his objective report and for the additional explanations he had given, which had enabled the Committee to view the report in its proper perspective. It was surprising that the States accused of co-operating with the racist régime of South Africa were seeking to accuse other States of having dealings with the same régime.

43. At the preceding meeting, the representative of Israel had been extremely irritated at being described by the Iraqi delegation as the representative of the Zionist entity. The Special Rapporteur, too, had just irritated the Israeli representative by revealing certain facts in his report. If the representative of the Zionist entity contested the truth of the facts set out in the report, he should produce evidence to substantiate his contentions instead of accusing the Special Rapporteur of a lack of integrity. The Committee was familiar with the logic of the representative of the Zionist entity. Anyone who denounced the crimes of that representative's country was automatically accused of anti-Semitism. The Iraqi delegation appealed to the common sense of all those who employed such logic, and affirmed that the oppressed peoples would triumph in the end.

44. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Special Rapporteur for his very objective report and the additional explanations he had given. The report provided a means for promoting action by the United Nations and mobilizing public opinion against the forces which supported the criminal apartheid régime. The debate on apartheid should have prompted those States which provided massive assistance to the South African régime in a wide range of areas, thereby ensuring its survival, to reflect and decide to discontinue such assistance. Obviously those States had no intention whatsoever of doing so. It was only natural to be indignant over such a situation. The report proved that the States in question, in particular the State represented by the delegation which had asked questions of the Special Rapporteur, were continuing to provide assistance to the apartheid régime by every means, including the most disreputable. It was intolerable that the delegations of the United States and Israel should accuse the Special Rapporteur of a lack of objectivity. They would succeed in fooling no one.

45. With regard to the accusations made by the United States delegation, the Soviet delegation had stated on numerous occasions in the General Assembly and in the Committee that the Soviet Union maintained no relations whatsoever with the racist régime. As to the IMF publication, everyone knew how such statistics were trumped up.

46. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America) renewed her request to the Special

/...

(Mrs. Haft, United States)

Rapporteur to include the information provided by her delegation in his next report. She expressed the hope that the next report would be more balanced and that the Special Rapporteur would carry out his task with complete objectivity.

47. Mrs. GOBIR (Nigeria) said that for her delegation the current session of the General Assembly was historic in two senses: it marked the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the twentieth anniversary of the admission of Nigeria to the Organization.

48. While many countries had acceded to independence since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), the decolonization process could not be complete until southern Africa had been freed from colonial domination and its peoples were able to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. Indeed, it was in southern Africa that the denial of the right to self-determination was to be seen in its most brutal form. After listening to a number of passionate statements on the defence of human rights and the demands for the right of the Afghan people to self-determination, her delegation could not but expect the adoption of positive measures in favour of the defence of the rights of the peoples of southern Africa. The Power which illegally occupied Namibia and had since 1966 denied the Namibian people the exercise of the right to self-determination should be totally isolated and should be the object of a strict economic and sports boycott.

49. The documents before the Committee made it clear that pressure to end all collaboration with South Africa should be intensified. As the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had confirmed in his report, the critical situation of human rights in South Africa and Namibia correlated with the volume of assistance accorded to the racist régime by certain Powers in all spheres - political, economic and military. Far from improving the lot of black Africans as was so often alleged by the collaborators, such assistance merely contributed to their further exploitation. Yet, the major Western Powers were opposed to the Security Council's imposing comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. No country could claim to defend human rights when it contributed to the large-scale denial of human rights committed by the apartheid régime in South Africa. Furthermore, it was difficult to understand how countries which openly supplied weapons to peoples in other parts of the world to fight for their right to self-determination at the same time refused to support the right of the South African people to struggle for self-determination by all means at their disposal.

50. The fact that South Africa could so openly defy the international community was indicative of the extent of the foreign collaboration from which it profited. If the Western Powers really wished to pressure South Africa into withdrawing from Namibia, they should initiate an energetic policy of disinvestment. Nigeria's position on that issue was very clear and, as its President had stated to the General Assembly on 6 October 1980, Nigeria would no longer tolerate provocations by South Africa or the dilatory tactics of its allies in the Western bloc with regard to Namibia's accession to independence and the establishment of majority rule.

/...

(Mrs. Gobir, Nigeria)

51. It was intolerable that South Africa's intransigence should continue to bedevil Namibia's accession to independence 14 years after the International Court of Justice had handed down a decision on the question and two years after the Security Council had endorsed the proposals of the five Western Powers on the transition to independence. At thirty-three sessions, the General Assembly had considered and condemned the policy of apartheid of the South African Government. The only peaceful means of combating the apartheid policy seemed to be the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Nigeria therefore called on the international community to discharge its moral responsibility by freeing Namibia from the stranglehold of South Africa and to adopt effective measures with a view to putting an end to all economic, political and military relations with South Africa and implementing the provisions of international instruments on the elimination of apartheid.

52. With regard to the Palestinian people, her delegation would support any initiative aimed at promoting peace and solving the Palestinian question that took into account the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. The PLO must participate in negotiations on the issue.

53. For its part, Nigeria would continue to support the legitimate demands of the Palestinians for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence within secure and recognized borders. Israel should realize that its own security was directly linked to the security of its neighbours and the inviolability of their territorial integrity.

54. Mr. MIDONZI (Burundi), after welcoming the two new Member States, Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, said that his country since its accession to independence had always been on the side of peoples struggling for independence and self-determination and supported the liberation movements.

55. Furthermore, Burundi had acceded to two very important international instruments, namely, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Burundi had always accorded its diplomatic and material support to peoples struggling against colonialism and foreign domination because it condemned racism and apartheid, its most vile form. Through the policy of apartheid, South Africa committed massive violations of the most basic human rights and thus gave proof of its flagrant contempt for the United Nations and the international community.

56. His delegation particularly deplored the fact that, despite the many resolutions and recommendations of the United Nations and other organizations, certain countries and institutions continued to provide the racist régime in South Africa with political, military and economic assistance and thus encouraged it to pursue even more relentlessly its policy of repression and bloody aggression. Burundi sympathized with the front-line States which were constantly subjected to armed incursions. It urgently appealed to all States and institutions which were accomplices of that inhuman régime to cease all collaboration. Economic interests should not take precedence over the security, indeed the survival, of an entire people.

/...

(Mr. Midonzi, Burundi)

which were accomplices of that inhuman régime to cease all collaboration. Economic interests should not take precedence over the security, indeed the survival, of an entire people.

57. Burundi could not forget the Sharpeville and Soweto massacres and would continue to support unreservedly the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa. The accession of the people of Zimbabwe to independence gave hope that the people of South Africa too would one day be freed from oppression.

58. The illegal occupation of Namibia remained one of the disturbing aspects of the situation in southern Africa and bore witness to the unbounded voracity of South Africa. Burundi expressed its solidarity with the Namibian people, reiterated its support of SWAPO, their legitimate representative, and reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people to self-determination and independence and their right to their natural resources.

59. The occupation of the Arab territories by Israel was another flagrant violation of the rights of a people, apart from the serious threat which such a situation posed for international peace and security. By refusing the Palestinian people the right to a territory and by occupying Arab territories, Israel flouted international law and defied the international community. His delegation assured the Palestinian people and their representative, the PLO, of his country's support in their legitimate struggle for the recognition of their inalienable rights to self-determination and national sovereignty.

60. Burundi looked forward to the elimination of racism both in its most virulent forms, such as apartheid and zionism, and in its most veiled manifestations.

61. Mr. SANKOH (Sierra Leone), after welcoming the admission of Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to the Organization, said that the process of decolonization had reached a critical stage because of the attitude of certain Powers and their proxies which had vested economic interests in the remaining colonies. Those Powers preached human rights but in fact supported inhuman policies. They warned of the danger to international peace and security while supplying arms and military technology and practising a policy which seriously threatened peace.

62. The year 1971 had been declared the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and 1973 had marked the launching of the Decade to the same end. Yet, despite numerous United Nations resolutions and decisions on the subject, the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel continued to defy the international community and remained deaf to the cries of civilized nations. Some delegations had told the Committee that it was better to try to influence and convince the racist and Zionist régimes than to isolate them, but patience of the international community would surely run out. It was imperative to give energetic support to the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and of Namibia, as well as that of the Palestinian people, to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

/...

(Mr. Sankoh, Sierra Leone)

63. Turning to the question of the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, he thanked the Special Rapporteur for having provided the list of institutions, organizations and individuals, as well as representatives of States, which gave assistance to those régimes. They were the true enemies of the suffering people of southern Africa.

64. The super-Powers should remember that they were pledged to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to bring harmony to a world torn by prejudice. Contemporary problems were such that new political will was needed from the international community to remedy them.

65. Referring to the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (A/35/197), he shared the concern expressed by the Ghanaian delegation at an earlier meeting in deploring the fact that only a small number of States had ratified or acceded to that Convention. Some of the States which had yet to accede to it, particularly the major Western Powers, abstained whenever the issue was put to a vote in the Organization. In the face of that situation, his delegation supported the suggestion that the Committee should hold one of its meetings in a developing country, notably in Africa, with a view to publicizing the most ignominious of racist practices.

66. In recalling that, according to the British historian Toynbee, racial segregation, nazism and zionism were the three categories of racism, and denouncing the evils of zionism, he concluded by drawing attention to the double standards of some super-Powers on the issue of the right to self-determination. While affirming the legitimacy of the fight for independence, they did not recognize that right for the blacks in southern Africa and for the Palestinian peoples. They preached that violence bred violence and therefore advised South Africa not to resort to repressive policies, while at the same time they continued to supply the very weapons used to perpetuate the régime. His delegation therefore urged all members of the Committee to adopt the draft resolutions before them, as presented.

67. Mrs. SAELZLER (German Democratic Republic), introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/35/L.5, announced that Yugoslavia had been inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors, which had subsequently also been joined by Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, Nicaragua, and Yemen.

68. She clarified that the purpose of the draft resolution was to strengthen the universality of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, which, to date, had been ratified by only 50 States, and thereby make it more effective in the struggle against apartheid, in the context of the Programme of activities for the second half of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

69. After enumerating the various measures provided in the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, she said that to mark the twentieth anniversary of the

/...

(Mrs. Saelzler, German Democratic Republic)

adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples all States should intensify their efforts to assist the just struggle of peoples oppressed by colonialism and racism, and to put an end to all the practices of the apartheid régime, which survived despite the virtually unanimous condemnation of the international community.

70. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, regretted that in the course of two earlier meetings the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, instead of speaking on the agenda items, had availed themselves of the right to speak in order to make distorted statements and false charges against the Governments of the United States and other countries.

71. The allegations made by those representatives in condemning possible intervention by the Western countries in the Middle East would be almost entertaining were it not for the direct Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, the use of surrogate military forces elsewhere, and the Soviet oppression of formerly independent nations, as well as of religious and ethnic minorities throughout the Soviet empire.

72. It was interesting to hear the Soviet representatives invoking the right of all peoples to self-determination, as set forth in article 1 of the International Covenants on Human Rights, and expressing concern about peoples they claimed were denied that right, while thousands of Afghan Moslems were being killed under Soviet fire, precisely because they were fighting to exercise that right. She was confident that the minorities and other oppressed groups in the Soviet Union - Ukrainians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Moslems, Tartars, Jews, and others - would greatly appreciate that radical change in Soviet policy which would permit them to exercise their right to self-determination.

73. The Soviet speakers asserted that their Governments had no economic ties with South Africa, yet the statistics of the International Monetary Fund revealed millions of dollars' worth of trade between the COMECON countries and South Africa, not to mention the marketing of diamonds through the South African-controlled DeBeers Limited, and Soviet fishing off the coast of Namibia, as disclosed by the statistics of the International Commission for South-East Atlantic Fisheries, which in no way benefited the peoples of that Territory.

74. With regard to Puerto Rico, the United States Government had repeatedly declared its support for whatever decision the people of Puerto Rico would make, exercising their right under democratic concepts, including freedom of expression. It was inappropriate for the Committee to discuss Puerto Rico; it was also an inappropriate forum in which to discuss the problem of Micronesia, which was within the jurisdiction of the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council. The people of Micronesia would soon exercise their right to self-determination in a plebescite to be held under United Nations observation.

75. Finally, the Soviet Union had accused the United States Government of hypocrisy in its human rights policies. The United States was an open society, and its strength, as well as its weaknesses, were on display for all the world to see, while the people of the Soviet Union would read reports of Third Committee debates in the Government-controlled press. Although the Soviet Union was a party to innumerable human rights instruments, it rarely paid the slightest attention to the terms of the

(Mrs. Haft, United States)

conventions it had ratified or the declarations it had supported. Religious groups, political dissidents, Afghan Moslems - the list was endless of those who could testify with first-hand knowledge to the abuses committed by the Soviet Union and the hypocrisy it had shown in the field of human rights.

76. Her delegation hoped that the Third Committee could return to the important work before it without being further interrupted by the outright falsehoods and unfounded charges of the representatives of the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics.

77. Mr. ZAHID DAULTANA (Pakistan), exercising his right of reply, recalled the statement that his delegation had made the day before on the problem of Jammu and Kashmir, in which it had reiterated Pakistan's commitment to seek a peaceful settlement of the problem in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations and the spirit of the Simla Agreement, in order to complete the process of normalization now in progress and usher in a new era of friendly relations with India.

78. Pakistan's position on the Simla Agreement had been fully explained in plenary meeting; it was based on the relevant Security Council resolutions. Sovereign States could not be denied their fundamental rights under the United Nations Charter to seek recourse to the United Nations for a peaceful settlement of their disputes, should other methods fail. India was within its right to state its position, but it was regrettable that it should doubt the sincere desire of Pakistan to normalize relations with it. That desire had been reiterated at the highest political level on numerous occasions. Pakistan's contacts with the Indian Government to accelerate the process of normalization continued. His delegation was happy to note that in the Indian delegation's statement there had been an implicit reiteration of his Government's commitment to the Simla Agreement

79. Mr. DRUMMOND (United Kingdom), exercising his right of reply, pointed out that it was easy to quote from newspapers, especially in a country where there was a free press; he himself had read in a recent article of the New York Times an article about the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic in which he was particularly interested. According to that article, one tribe there had been so badly persecuted by the Soviet authorities that it had sought refuge in Afghanistan and then, after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, in Pakistan. One might wonder if it now considered going to Alaska.

80. Another thing which the Soviet delegation tended to do when it did not like something said by the United Kingdom was to refer to the situation in Northern Ireland, as though the United Kingdom needed lessons from the Soviet Union on the protection of human rights. Any delegate interested in the facts could find a useful summary in document A/CN.4/1406.

81. With regard to the quotation from Lenin for which the United Kingdom delegation had been reproached, it was not an isolated statement. Lenin had written a great deal about self-determination and nationalism. Nationalism was a

/...

(Mr. Drummond, United Kingdom)

very difficult problem for the new Soviet State which had inherited a massive colonial empire with non-Russian possessions not only in Europe but also in Asia, and it wanted to hang on to them. But for tactical reasons lip-service had to be paid to self-determination. However, the longer-term aim was clear, and as early as 1916 Lenin had written that the secession of Finland and Poland after the victory of socialism would be of short duration, but that the fellahins, the Mongolians and the Persians, who were infinitely less cultural, could secede for a longer period; an attempt would be made, however, to shorten that period. If one related Lenin's remark to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, it was no wonder that the Soviet delegation did not appreciate the quotation from its ideological mentor.

82. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) exercising his right of reply, thanked Mr. Khalifa for his attempt at an explanation. He assured him that Israel would not panic, and looked forward with pleasure to the continuation of a fruitful dialogue.

83. He would confine himself to several general remarks in response to the untruthful allegations and attacks against his Government on the part of various delegations, many of which represented régimes notorious for their violations of human rights, racial discrimination and denial of the right of self-determination. To the extent that there was a racial approach in the Arab-Israel conflict, it came from the Arab side, not from Israel. Likewise, if there was a complete denial of the right of self-determination of any people, it came from the side of Arab Governments with regard to Israel, and not from Israel with regard to any Arab people.

84. The very right of Israel to self-determination and existence was denied by different Arab States which supported the aims of the terrorist PLO. It was the policy of the PLO which was the main obstacle for peace between Israel and its neighbours, including the Palestinian Arabs. It was that reckless policy which had led the Palestinian Arabs from one disaster to another for four decades, and which was responsible for the continuous suffering of the peoples of the region, Israelis and Arabs alike.

85. Threatened as it was by Arab war-mongers, terrorism and other forms of aggression, Israel was obliged and entitled to take defensive and precautionary steps. It was in a similar situation to the liberation movements and would exercise its rights as a liberation movement. Some of the steps it had been constrained to take did indeed cause hardship, but the responsibility for that lay with those who pursued belligerency and rejected peace. The countries that chose to advocate Arab claims in general, and those of the PLO in particular, without at the same time recalling and emphasizing Israel's inalienable right to self-determination, security and peace, were in fact contributing to the continuation of the conflict between Israel and the Arabs.

86. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation wished to clarify one point and comment on some of the remarks made by Mr. Khalifa the Friday before. Although the Special Rapporteur had seen fit to refer to deliveries of arms that France was supposed to have made to the

/...

(Mr. Giustetti, France)

Republic of South Africa, his delegation had already dealt with that allegation in the Third Committee and elsewhere. France did not supply arms to South Africa. It strictly observed Security Council resolution 418 of 4 November 1977, and had taken the necessary steps to put an end to all supplies of arms and related materials to South Africa since the adoption of that resolution. No arms export licence had been issued since that time, and all previous licences had been revoked.

87. His delegation therefore deplored the fact that assertions so manifestly at variance with the truth could be put forward in the Third Committee. The list drawn up by the Special Rapporteur was not, moreover, without errors. The method used to compile it did not afford all the accuracy and impartiality that might be desired, and thus could not but raise doubts as to the conclusions to be derived from such a paper.

88. Mr. RIGIN (Indonesia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said his delegation regretted the fact that the Mozambican delegation's statement had contained unfounded allegations and falsehoods in reference to East Timor.

89. The people of East Timor had already exercised their right to self-determination by deciding in 1976 to integrate with the Republic of Indonesia in conformity with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). The United Nations had been kept fully informed of developments during that process, and the relevant reports were readily available to the delegations of Member States.

90. The people of the province of East Timor were now living in peace and were benefiting from development programmes in unity with all other Indonesians, and his delegation could only deplore Mozambique's persistence in ignoring their freely expressed will.

91. Mr. RANGASHARI (India), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that the Indian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Permanent Representative had explained the Indian Government's position regarding the State of Jammu and Kashmir at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 3 October. It was regrettable, therefore, that the Pakistan delegation had brought the matter up again at the current meeting and the previous day. He could only repeat what his delegation had stated the previous day, namely that every time the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which formed an integral part of the Union of India, was mentioned in an international forum, the strictly bilateral process of settling the dispute and normalizing relations between India and Pakistan suffered a setback.

92. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, remarked that the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had one point in common: they had not dared to deny the incontestable facts mentioned by the Soviet delegation regarding the role their two countries played in the international arena.

93. On the substance of the issue, his delegation only wished to recall that the Soviet Union had always stood up to attacks from the forces of imperialism.

/...

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

It took pride in the fact that it had always ensured that Soviet nationals could enjoy all their rights and all their freedoms, without distinction as to race, sex or social origins. The people living in the United States and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, could do no more than hope to enjoy their rights in the future.

94. As for the situation in Afghanistan, he pointed out that British interventionist troops had committed acts of brutality in Soviet territory when the Soviet Union had still been in its infancy, and that the United States had resorted to force more than 200 times since the Second World War and constantly, as was generally recognized, trampled human rights underfoot.

95. Mr. ARMALI (Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, commented that, in spite of the slanders and lies that the Zionist delegation continued to spread, the vast majority of countries around the world recognized in the PLO the champion of the legitimate aspirations of an oppressed people. If one of the principal tenets of the racist and exclusive Zionist doctrine was that the Palestinian people did not exist, it was hardly surprising that Israel bore them malice and sought to annihilate them.

96. He failed to see how the representative of Israel could speak of a right to peace and security when the Zionist entity was founded on usurpation, disregard for the law, and the occupation of Arab territories in which it had established more than 130 settlements since 1967.

97. Even though the PLO wished to reaffirm its emphatic condemnation of the deplorable attacks on Jewish and Hebraic institutions that had taken place recently in some countries, it was plain that the Zionist entity was using the disturbances for its own ends. Why did the representative of Israel harp endlessly on the martyrdom of the Jews during the Second World War? A good many other people had suffered atrocities at the hands of the Nazis. The Soviet Union, not to speak of the Yugoslavs, the Greeks, the gypsies and others, had lost 20 million of its inhabitants in the conflict, but it did not spend its time counting its dead. The international community should not be taken in by the odious blackmail that Israel was forever practising with the help of information media all too clearly committed to its cause.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.