

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th 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, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.3/35/SR.26  
24 October 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.3, L.8/Rev.2 and L.10)

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

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.7 and L.13)
- (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) (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/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) (A/C.3/35/L.11)

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/C.3/35/L.6 and L.12)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited discussion of draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.3 through L.13.

2. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that there were certain unacceptable elements in draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.3, L.11 and L.12. Each of the three draft resolutions recalled the high principles of the United Nations in the field of human rights but each injected additional concepts, assertions and recommendations, some of which were diametrically opposed to those very principles and were in contradiction with the United Nations Charter. The adoption of similar resolutions in the past had, in certain cases, rendered a disservice to the genuine cause of the fight against racism and racial discrimination throughout the world and in support of the right of self-determination. Legitimate intentions had been contaminated by cynicism, hypocrisy and destructive designs and had deprived such resolutions of moral, legal and pragmatic value.

3. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3, recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1980/7, was unacceptable for various reasons. It referred to the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which included unwarranted and misguided references to Israel and the national movement of its people. The draft resolution was unacceptable also because in paragraph 1 it attributed to Israel a racial

(Mr. Cahana, Israel)

approach in the areas under its administration. That false charge had been refuted on many occasions. In other paragraphs the draft resolution expressed unqualified support for the warmongering and terrorist activities of organizations which were dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel. By doing so, the draft resolution betrayed the most basic principles of the United Nations Charter and of world order, and ignored the right of the people of Israel to self-determination and to other basic human rights.

4. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.12 had been submitted by a member of the Arab League on behalf of the African Group. It purported to deal with the right of peoples to self-determination. It reflected the well-known tactic of members of the Arab League of exploiting the genuine concern of most Member States of the United Nations in order to promote their own implacable, hostile campaign against Israel. The draft resolution attempted to compare and equate Arab claims on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs with the genuine struggle for self-determination. That false equation was a perversion of the facts of history and the nature of the Arab-Israel conflict. It was a transparent disguise intended to justify a relentless effort to delegitimize the State of Israel and to further the evil conspiracy of the members of the new Arab League. Israel lived, worked and co-operated with other nations in solving their problems; yet, according to the sponsors of the draft resolution, all such activity constituted a threat to world peace. That absurd assertion would do nothing to promote international mutual understanding and co-operation.

5. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.11 singled out Israel by name and repeated unfounded charges against Israel including the false allegation on co-operation in the nuclear field. The Secretary-General's report (A/35/400) did not confirm any such "speculations", again demonstrating a disdain for facts, promotion of fabrications and an obsession with Israel in the minds of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

6. The complaint that the prestige and authority of the United Nations were in decline was often heard in the international community. That decline was due in part to the adoption of such resolutions in the Committee.

7. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said that he would support draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7. Paragraph 13, however, which requested that one session of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination be held in one of the developing countries, must be considered within the context of the States Parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Committee represented Member States that had signed the Convention, and any decision concerning the venue of its sessions must be taken by the parties to that Convention. The expenses of such a meeting should be borne by the States Parties.

8. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 and considered it well-founded. It also supported draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.4 and L.5, since adherence by the largest number of States to the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* and the *Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid* would help the struggle of the United Nations to combat racism and racial discrimination. His

/...

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

delegation shared the view of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4 that the amendment contained in A/C.3/35/L.9 was not justified, and believed that the draft resolution should be adopted without amendment. His delegation had no objection to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7; the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, acting under the relevant Convention, had made an important contribution in the implementation of the Programme for the Decade. His delegation had no objections to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8 and could accept the text of document A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 provided the content did not differ from the Rev.1. He thanked the States members of the African Group for their work on draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.11 and L.12. He was convinced that those resolutions met the goal of mobilizing world opinion against assistance to colonialist and racist régimes by States and transnational corporations. His delegation fully supported the two draft resolutions.

9. It appeared that two contrary goals were being pursued in draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.10 and L.6, although they were under the same item of the agenda. There was no doubt that the first draft resolution (A/C.3/35/L.10) took into account the struggle of the international community for decolonization and met the urgent requirements for achieving that objective; the Soviet Union therefore fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.10. However, the second draft resolution (A/C.3/35/L.6) had nothing in common with item 74 or with the tasks of the Committee. The Soviet Union agreed with the need for general respect for human rights and self-determination, and it opposed foreign military intervention. That position was consistent with its efforts to achieve self-determination for the Palestinian and Namibian peoples. If the sponsors of the draft resolution were really guided by the goal stated in agenda item 75, they should not introduce extraneous ideas. The draft resolution was nothing but propaganda and diverted attention from vital problems; the Soviet Union therefore strongly opposed draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.6.

10. Mrs. FLOREZ PRIDA (Cuba) expressed appreciation to the African Group for submitting draft resolutions L.11 and L.12, which reflected the Committee's concerns and reproduced the thrust of statements made in previous years on the need to cease all economic, political, military and other co-operation with racist régimes in southern Africa and the need for free self-determination and independence for the peoples of that region. Her delegation wished to become a co-sponsor of both draft resolutions.

11. Her delegation had serious problems regarding the drafting of draft resolution L.6, which deviated from the goals stated in agenda item 75, namely, realization of the right to self-determination and the speedy attainment of independence by colonial peoples. More emphasis should have been placed on the colonial situation and other important resolutions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its most recent session should have been mentioned, for example, resolution 2 (XXXVI), resolution 4 (XXXVI) and resolution 5 (XXXVI). She was surprised at that oversight on the part of the sponsors. Her delegation would find it difficult to vote for certain paragraphs of draft resolution L.6, in particular the last preambular paragraph.

12. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) thanked the members of the Committee who had prepared draft resolutions L.3, L.4, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.8, L.11 and L.12. His delegation had no difficulties with draft resolutions L.3, L.4 (without the amendment in L.9), or with L.5 and L.7. He commended the efforts of

/...

(Mr. Ogurtsov, Byelorussian SSR)

the African Group, which had prepared draft resolutions L.11 and L.12. The collective work of the African Group had been so productive that those two draft resolutions needed virtually no corrections or additions and could be adopted without a vote. His delegation fully supported them.

13. His delegation had difficulties, however, with draft resolution L.6. It was customary for the Committee to adopt only one resolution on each item, in the case of the present question, the one normally submitted by the African countries. Draft resolution L.6 introduced a new, unacceptable and undesirable element into the question and he therefore appealed to the sponsors to withdraw it.

14. Mrs. THANH (Viet Nam) said that her delegation, which had always been firmly opposed to racism and to all forms of racial discrimination and its most appalling manifestation, apartheid, firmly supported draft resolutions L.5, L.4 and L.7. Her delegation also fully supported the two draft resolutions submitted by the African Group, L.11 and L.12, and wished to become a sponsor of both.

15. Her delegation had serious difficulties, however, with draft resolution L.6, which was outside the context of the agenda item concerned. It made no mention of the colonial peoples' struggle nor of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was a core document and had served as a basis for all relevant General Assembly resolutions on the question of implementation of peoples' right to self-determination. Not only did it fail to take account of the two current flagrant examples of violation of human rights and peoples' right to self-determination, namely Israel's occupation of Palestine and the atrocious conditions imposed on the people of southern Africa and Namibia; what was particularly serious, it referred to tendentious resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights which her delegation had strongly opposed. She opposed draft resolution L.6, particularly its last preambular paragraph.

16. The CHAIRMAN, replying to questions from Mr. NYAMEKEYE (Ghana), Mrs. SEMIHI (Algeria), Mr. DIRESSO (Ethiopia) and Mr. CABRERA (Spain), said that he would, in accordance with rules 106 and 120 of the rules of procedure, accept oral or written amendments to draft resolutions prior to a vote. He would allow substantive amendments to be made orally and also, if need be, discussion of the draft resolutions if the proposed amendments affected their content.

17. Mrs. SANTANDER DOWLING (Secretary of the Committee) informed members that Niger had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions L.4 and L.7, the People's Republic of Angola had joined the sponsors of draft resolution L.5, Papua New Guinea had withdrawn its sponsorship of draft resolution L.8/Rev.2, and Cuba had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions L.11 and L.12.

18. Miss SHALHOUB (Jordan) expressed her delegation's sincere condolences to the delegation of Algeria on the recent earthquake in the El-Asnam area, which had caused such serious human and material losses.

(Miss Shalhoub, Jordan)

19. Speaking in exercise of her right of reply, she recalled that the previous week, the Committee had heard an attack by the Israeli delegation on two Arab States which it had described as aggressive and not peaceful. United Nations and United States State Department records were full of data and papers on mediation undertaken to settle the Middle East crisis over more than a decade, including the efforts of Gunnar Jarring, in pursuance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), United States Secretary of State William Rogers and his assistant Joseph Sisco, and Dr. Henry Kissinger. The Arab countries concerned had co-operated fully with those mediators, in an open-minded attitude, but all their efforts had come to naught because of the obduracy of Israel, which had not been prepared to withdraw from the territories occupied in 1967 in accordance with United Nations resolutions, as confirmed by all documents relating to those efforts.

20. The Arab countries had repeatedly called for a comprehensive and just peace involving the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestinian people, as represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, their sole legitimate representative. The incontrovertible facts were Israel's refusal to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people and its refusal even to acknowledge their existence. The Zionist people had viewed Palestine as an unpopulated land, as if it had been an empty desert for over 40 centuries. That idea was entrenched in the minds of Zionist leaders, as was clear from Golda Meir's book "The Story of My Life", published in 1973, in which she said: "There is no people called the Palestinian people". For Israeli leaders, there was no State called Jordan either, because according to the principles of the Herut Party founded in 1933 by Menachem Begin, the Israeli entity should extend beyond the Jordan to include the whole of the eastern bank, even 8 kilometres beyond Amman, the capital of Jordan. From 1948 onwards, the Herut Party had striven to implement those plans by terrorizing the Palestinian Arab population, with Begin himself carrying out the Deir Yassim massacre in 1948, as stated in his autobiography entitled "The Revolt". The Herut Party was now known as the Likud Party, but its head remained unchanged, the number of its members had grown and it had formed a coalition and was now in power. In the 1977 elections, 63 per cent had voted for the Likud Party.

21. The high percentage of young people voting for the establishment of settlements and the consolidation of the occupation by Israeli military authorities had been enough to terrorize the Arab people and trigger their exodus, with expropriation of their land and harassment, revealing the seriousness of Israel's intentions. Israel was clearly acting on the aggressive principles of that Party and confirming another principle essential to successive Israeli leaders over the past 33 years, namely, refusal to acknowledge the delimitation of the borders of the Israeli entity and categorical rejection of all requests to consider the issue. Many other items of evidence attested to that position: the annexation of 30.5 per cent of Arab territory occupied in 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the proclamation that the trans-Jordan area should henceforth be called Judea and Samaria, a plan for the annexation of the Golan Heights and the expansionist policy regarding the territories in southern Lebanon. Those were acts of aggression against Arab States in general.

22. Lastly, the representative of the PLO, who was present, had been born in Haifa. She doubted that the representative of the Zionist entity - who seemed to

/...

(Miss Shalhoub, Jordan)

be more than 33 years old - had been born in Palestine, but he did live on Palestinian soil. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians had been expelled from their own lands.

23. Miss MONTEIRO (Mozambique), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that she wished to inform the representative of Indonesia that her country would always denounce denial of the right to self-determination as long as colonialism continued to exist. The General Assembly and the Security Council had adopted a number of resolutions recognizing that the people of East Timor had not yet exercised their right to self-determination. The Portuguese Government had declared that it did not recognize the annexation of East Timor by Indonesia. The people of East Timor, through their heroic armed struggle for national liberation, demanded respect for their sovereignty and their territorial integrity.

24. Mrs. HUSSEIN (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, expressed deep disappointment that the Indian delegation in its right of reply to her delegation's statement of 13 October had repeatedly expressed doubts about her Government's commitment to the Simla Agreement concluded between Pakistan and India in 1972. That Agreement recognized the existence of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir as well as the importance of resolving all outstanding issues for the normalization of relations between India and Pakistan.

25. Pakistan remained committed to the Simla Agreement in its letter and spirit, as stated by the President and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on several occasions. Her Government sincerely hoped that the Government of India would remain committed to the Agreement and, like Pakistan, would make every endeavour to further the process of normalization of relations between the two countries.

26. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that on 14 October, the representative of the United States, engaging in verbal acrobatics, had tried to present the United States as a champion of the right of peoples to self-determination. Just a few facts could be cited to indicate that the reverse was true.

27. Since the beginning of the century, the United States had directly or indirectly resorted to the use of force against other peoples or threatened interference more than 200 times and had threatened to use nuclear weapons more than 30 times. To mention a few instances from the long record of provocation: in 1953, the CIA had prepared an uprising in Iran and overthrown the then Prime Minister; in 1958, under the pretext of a threat from the USSR to Lebanon, it had invaded that country, uninvited; in 1961, counter-revolutionaries trained in the United States had disembarked in the Bay of Pigs in Cuba; in the same year, the dispatch of military units to South Viet-Nam had begun: by 1969, they numbered over 50,000; in 1980, with the participation of the CIA, the United States had established dozens of bases to train interventionists to commit aggressive attacks against the territory of Afghanistan.

28. The United States military in Viet Nam had not exactly been assisting the people of that country in realizing their right of self-determination. Everyone was well aware that United States aggression had cost the lives of hundreds of

/...



(Mr. Ozadovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

thousands of peaceful inhabitants of South Viet Nam, including defenceless women, children and old people. In the course of that adventure the Americans had dropped more bombs than during the Second World War. The symbol of American "democracy" for the peoples of Indo-China were napalm and poisonous substances.

29. No one could forget the sinister role played by United States special services in the murder of the popularly elected President of Chile, Salvador Allende, and the establishment in that country of a military fascist dictatorship. Mention could also be made of United States support for dictators like Somoza in Nicaragua and the Shah in Iran, who had suppressed the attempts of their people to assert the very right of self-determination which the United States allegedly championed.

30. The United States representative had invoked unfounded allegations in an attempt to refute the fact that the United States had violated the right of peoples to self-determination. In that connexion, it was relevant to mention paragraphs 4 and 7 of resolution A/AC.109/628 of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted only two months previously, concerning the right of self-determination of the Puerto Rican people. A great many United Nations documents could be mentioned which clearly invalidated the attempts of the representative of the United States to justify that country's actions.

31. The United States representative had made a gross attack against the Ukrainian people. The Ukrainian people had realized its right to self-determination over 60 years previously when the workers and peasants of the Ukraine had overthrown the system of exploitation and for the first time in history established their own State, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Subsequently, when as a result of the free self-determination of the people and on the basis of free will and equal rights with the fraternal republics, it had joined the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian SSR had acquired joint guarantees of its sovereignty and its vital interests. In accordance with the Constitution of the USSR and of the Ukrainian SSR, the Ukrainian Republic actively exercised its sovereign rights, including its rights in the field of international relations. The United States representative therefore had no grounds for concern that the Ukrainian people was not realizing its right of self-determination.

32. Ms. HAPT (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, nearly one week after the Committee had moved on to new agenda items, it had suddenly reverted to hearing rights of reply to statements made a week previously on the items concerning self-determination and racial discrimination. Although it might be beneficial to certain delegations, such scheduling appeared rather curious to her delegation. In the previous week, her delegation had responded to three unprovoked attacks on her Government by representatives of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR. Understandably, her delegation's response had not been well received by the Soviet representatives, whose intemperate reactions had wasted the Committee's time and graphically demonstrated the traditional determination of the Soviet representatives not to allow themselves to be confused by the facts.

/...



(Ms. Haft, United States)

33. As the world had learned long ago, Soviet rhetoric bore little relation to Soviet action. Her delegation would not dignify the wild accusations of the Soviet representatives with a response they did not merit and would not compound the damage done to the Committee by the Soviet representatives by taking more of its time to discredit each of their distorted statements and outright falsehoods.

34. It was both ironic and tragic to hear Soviet representatives speak of self-determination. Whatever they had to say on the subject, it was necessary only to look at a map of Europe and at the situation in Afghanistan to know what the Soviet Union did to peoples who attempted to exercise their right to self-determination. The irony and the tragedy was heightened when a Ukrainian representative spoke of self-determination. No people had suffered more under Soviet oppression than Ukrainians. Ukrainians comprised only 20 per cent of the population of the Soviet Union, but 50 per cent of Soviet political prisoners were Ukrainian. The Ukrainian Catholic Church had been brutally suppressed, synagogues had been closed, and churches had been converted to museums of atheism. For attempting to exercise their legal rights, members of the Ukrainian Monitoring Group for the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe had been imprisoned or confined in psychiatric hospitals, including Mykola Rudenko, Levko Lukyanenko, Oksana Popovych and a host of others. Before speaking of self-determination, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR should remember the fable of the parrot which had grown so accustomed to repeating everything his master said that when he tried to say something on his own, he could think only of his master's statements.

35. The Soviet representatives had chosen to ignore some rather basic points concerning what they perceived as violations of human rights in the United States. In contrast to the situation in the Soviet empire, complete information on such matters was available to everyone, including the Soviet representatives, through the operation of an independent press and other media. In the unlikely event that any of the Soviet representatives became residents of the United States, they could continue to say and publish what they had already said in the Committee, no matter how false those statements were. Everyone knew what happened to those living within the Soviet empire who dared to tell the truth about the human rights violations by the Soviet Government at home and abroad.

36. Her delegation had made it very clear that it considered the work of the Committee too important to take up its valuable time with rights of reply; it had been willing to forego a response to the Soviet right of reply in the previous week in the belief that it would be in the best interests of the Committee. Not satisfied with a ratio of four attacks to one response, however, the Soviet Union had chosen to place its propaganda interests ahead of the Committee's interests. Her delegation deplored the decision by the Soviet representatives and hoped that all delegations would exercise restraint in the future.

37. Mrs. GU (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that on 13 and 14 October the representatives of the USSR and the Byelorussian SSR, using language from the same mould, had viciously attacked and slandered China. The

/...

(Mrs. Gu, China)

Soviet representative had alleged that China carried out "armed aggression" and gave "support to a puppet régime", whereas the facts were that China did not have a single soldier on foreign soil while in Afghanistan alone, the Soviet troops numbered 100,000. It was quite clear who the aggressor was. The Soviet representative claimed that the Soviet Union had sent troops of aggression against Afghanistan in response to the request of the Afghan Government. Such gibberish had long since been properly repudiated by world opinion and by the many delegations attending United Nations meetings. His delegation suggested that the Soviet representative urge his Government to speedily withdraw its troops from Afghanistan in accordance with the resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority at the special session of the General Assembly. Otherwise it would never escape international judgement.

38. Mr. ABAVI (Afghanistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that when the national independence of his country had been seriously threatened by imperialist aggression, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had asked the Soviet Union, the tested friend of the Afghan people, for immediate moral, political and economic assistance to ward off that aggression. The Soviet Government, in line with its consistent support of internationalism and its principled foreign policy of aid to liberation movements of peoples subjected to colonialist and imperialist aggression, had responded positively to the repeated requests of the Afghan Government and sent a limited military contingent to Afghanistan.

39. Their task was and remained one of helping the people of Afghanistan in their struggle against aggressors and warding off intervention by enemies of Afghan freedom and independence. The Soviet aid to the people of Afghanistan in no way conflicted with the interests of any third country and was in full accord with the spirit of the treaty of friendship, good neighbourliness and co-operation concluded by the two States on 5 December 1978, with international law, and with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

40. The freedom-loving people of Afghanistan, which had valorously struggled against colonial and alien domination and secured its national independence and sovereignty, would always remain independent and would never compromise its freedom. The imperialists and the reactionary circles which were exploiting the developments in Afghanistan to further their own nefarious designs in the region should realize that fact. The imperialists and their allies were continuing their malicious propaganda campaign for the purpose of blackmailing Afghanistan and the revolution of the Afghan people and of distorting the facts about Afghan-Soviet relations. They must accept the revolutionary changes brought about by peoples as an undeniable reality.

41. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in her right of reply, the United States representative had not even had the courtesy to use the official name of the USSR; that approach was unacceptable in United Nations practice and contrary to the rules of civilized society. The slander, deliberate lies and distortions of reality in her statement did not merit a serious reply. It was the United States Delegation which had delayed the work of the Committee: in its first right of reply, the United States delegation had heaped so much slander on other delegations that it could scarcely expect them to have nothing to say in reply.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

42. The United States representative had attempted to sidestep incontrovertible facts about the constant, gross violations of basic human rights by the United States in its own country and abroad which were well known and which she had not even tried to deny. She was well aware of the monstrous crimes of the United States aggressors in Indo-China and the grave consequences of that aggression which were the basic reason for the continuing poverty and suffering of the peoples of the region. The United States delegation had tried to cover its tracks by making insinuations against other sovereign States. It had misused the Committee's time by putting forward malicious fabrications unrelated to the work of the Committee which the Soviet delegation categorically rejected. He would remind the United States representative that she was not engaged in an election campaign.

43. The Soviet Union was not deceived by the slanderous attacks of the representative of China. Although China claimed to be a champion of the right to self-determination, its actions demonstrated a policy of expansionism, and its attempts to attribute its own aspirations to others could not but fail. That policy was shown by Beijing's support for anti-government separatist movements in nearly all the neighbouring countries, its recent aggression against a neighbouring peace-loving State and, in collusion with the United States, its dispatch of mercenary bands to the territory of sovereign Afghanistan.

44. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the slanderous accusations of the United States proved nothing and were an insult to those who had to listen to them. Those who did not adhere to moral principles were trying to lecture others; those who violated human rights were talking about humanitarianism; those who represented economic and social systems based on the enslavement and exploitation of the people to enrich a handful of millionaires and giant corporations were talking loftily about social justice.

45. It was fitting to recall that the former United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Andrew Young, had recognized that thousands of political prisoners were languishing in American jails. The New York Times of 15 April 1980 had reported that some 25 million people in the United States were below the poverty line. The fires in Miami and the crimes of the racists there and in other cities clearly revealed the flagrant national and racial inequality in the United States. It was significant that the United States had not yet signed the International Covenants on Human Rights. That was because it had no desire to give the outcasts of society - the Mexicans and Indians - the support of internationally recognized instruments. Moreover, the United States would be forced to answer to the international community and international bodies for its violations of human rights, the thousands of jailed civil rights leaders, racial discrimination, political genocide of the Indians, and the millions of unemployed. As had already been noted during the Committee's discussions, it was precisely with the support of the United States that large and small dictatorships were continuing to suppress the rights of the people.

46. The slanderous statement made by the United States representative had been directed particularly against the Ukrainian people. That people had built a free State, the Ukrainian SSR, in their own land. Its enormous industrial potential

/...

(Mr. Ozadovsky, Ukrainian SSR)

had increased 10 times over the past 40 years; that was an extraordinary achievement of the Ukrainian people. The development of the economy, science and culture had been recognized throughout the world. In 1979, the Ukrainian SSR's report on its implementation of provisions of the International Conventions on Human Rights had been widely acclaimed in the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council.

47. By naming individuals who were allegedly being persecuted, the United States representative had attempted to interfere in the personal affairs of renegades from socialist countries and to interfere in the internal affairs of other States under the hollow pretext of protecting human rights. Such statements had no legal or political foundation.

48. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that, after the many acrimonious and sterile exchanges between Israeli and Arab representatives throughout the United Nations system, he wondered whether there was any use in trying to correct the distortions and dispel the confusion in the statement of the Jordanian representative. Unfortunately there were no opportunities to discuss such matters face to face in a reasonable manner, so those discussions had to take place in Committees.

49. The Arab-Israeli conflict was so complicated that solutions could only be sought not through acrimonious exchanges but through direct dialogue. If the Jordanian representative talked to Israelis, she would be surprised how much they understood about the concerns and grievances of Arabs and Palestinian Arabs, and how anxious they were that their own grievances and aspirations should be understood. The root of the Arab-Israeli conflict was the absence of dialogue.

50. Many delegations failed to understand the essence of Zionism as the national liberation movement of the Jewish people because it was unique and in many ways more revolutionary than most other national liberation movements. The Jews had had to gather in their ancient homeland after living as persecuted minorities throughout the world and not the least in the Arab countries, and then build a country and strive for independence and sovereignty. Many national liberation movements had achieved independence without fighting through evolutionary political processes; the Jews had had to fight for survival right from the beginning, not only for liberation from rule by the United Kingdom but also, in the first place, to defend themselves against their Arab neighbours, who refused to recognize that they too had the right to self-determination and nationhood.

51. Some Arab Governments and representatives still deluded themselves with the belief that they could liquidate the State of Israel. No Zionist could conceive of liquidating the Arabs living around Israel, not only for moral and ethical reasons but also for pragmatic reasons and reasons of self-interest. The Jews were looking for a way to coexist with their Arab neighbours. Yet, some Arab *régimes and sectors* denied Israel's right to exist in any territory at all. The question was not simply territorial, however, since many Arab countries, including Iraq and Libya, denied Israel's very right to exist. The President of Libya had referred to Israel as a "deformed entity". Such beliefs could only be attributed to ignorance and misunderstanding about Jewish history, and the sooner they were dispelled, the better.

(Mr. Cahana, Israel)

52. The Jews had originally been Palestinians and during the Second World War, when they had wished to fight against nazism and fascism, they had joined the British Army as Palestinians. The problem lay in the continuing refusal of the Arabs to reconcile themselves to the idea that Israelis, Jews and Arabs could coexist.

53. The Palestinian Arabs belonged to a people with a glorious history, the Arab people. As late as the 1960s the Palestinian Arabs had denied that they wanted an independent political entity since they regarded themselves as Syrians. Leaders of the terrorist Palestinian Liberation Organization had admitted that the establishment of a Palestine Arab State was only a stage towards union with Syria as one country. The whole concept of self-determination was very flexible in the Arab world and in other parts of the world. Israel regarded Jordan as a Palestinian State in which Palestinians exercised the right to self-determination since the majority of Jordanians were Palestinians. Israel hoped for a solution of reconciliation and peace.

54. Mr. ARMALI (Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had given the impression that he represented a humanitarian or welfare organization. Obviously that was not so because the Zionist entity had increased its raids into southern Lebanon and against the Palestinians, resulting in a large number of civilian casualties. The Zionist representative had displayed hypocrisy and cynicism and had falsified history by claiming that the Zionist entity was seeking peace. That entity had annexed Jerusalem and continued to increase its settlements in the occupied territories 14 years after the usurpation of the West Bank and Gaza. Other annexations were contemplated, such as that of the Golan Heights.

55. The Zionist representative had stated that the Arabs did not wish to coexist with the Jews. He, the representative of the PLO, had many Jewish friends and had had them for many years. Zionism, however, was aimed at the gathering of all Jews into Palestine with a view to denying the Palestinians their rights. Judaism was nothing but a religion and was used by the Zionists to justify their occupation. The Palestinians would accept nothing less than a Palestinian homeland in the territory where their ancestors were buried.

56. Mr. HAMOUD (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation could not accept the insults hurled at members of the Committee by the Zionist representative. Zionism was not a national liberation movement. To call Zionism a national liberation movement was to insult the United Nations, which had classified it as a form of racism based on the superiority of one group over another.

57. The Zionists wanted Jews to leave their societies of origin and settle in Palestine in order to eliminate the Palestinians. Zionism was similar to nazism and racism as practised in South Africa, Israel, the fruit of Zionism, had not sprung from a national liberation movement but from racism. That was why the Iraqis rejected dialogue with the Zionists. There had been Jews in Iraq and other countries who had been hoodwinked by the Zionists and it was for that reason that the Arabs were hostile to the Zionists but not to the Jews, who were their cousins.

/...

58. Mr. ABDUL-AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that zionism, which had had contacts with nazism, was also based on imperialism. At the end of the nineteenth century, a Zionist writer had stated that the Zionist State would appear 50 years later. The State had appeared 48 years later, an indication of long established Zionist planning to expel the Palestinians. It was well known that wealthy Jews had financed nazism before the Second World War. The Zionist State had been created in 1948 because the United Nations had then been under the domination of imperialist Powers. Racist zionism was born out of expansionism and the Zionist State was still the only Member State in the United Nations without set borders. It exercised sovereignty over Jews all over the world.

59. In 1948 the Palestinians had been in the majority. However, as a result of Zionist immigration and expansionism, the Arabs were now in the minority. The Arabs wished only for the Palestinians to live together with their close cousins, the Jews. They rejected zionism because it was a racist movement and would remain that until it accepted the idea that Arabs and Jews should live together in one land in a democratic State.

60. Miss SHALHOUB (Jordan) said that the representative of the Zionist entity had shown himself sensitive to facts because what she had stated were facts by Israeli writers, namely, Golda Meir and Menachem Begin. Unlike what the Zionist representative had stated, Palestine had been given its name in the twentieth century B.C. when the Philistines had been there. The official name in the 1920s had been the Emirate of Transjordan. It was true that greater Syria had comprised Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine because the Syrian Arab Party had called for unification. The reference by the Zionist representative to that fact meant that the Zionists wished to keep the occupied lands and would continue their expansionism to include northern Jordan.

61. Zionism was not a national liberation movement because it had started in the nineteenth century when Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan were part of the Ottoman Empire. Arabs and Jews had lived together for centuries and even Jews from Europe would have been welcomed in Palestine had they not come with arms to uproot the Palestinians. Had they come to live as part of the existing culture, then Arab traditions would not have allowed their expulsion. The Encyclopaedia Judaica showed how many Jews had been converted to zionism and Arthur Koestler in his book, "The Thirteenth Tribe", demonstrated that they had never been from Palestine.

62. The Zionist representative had said that Jordan was a Palestinian State. Jordanians were proud to have given refuge to all who had come with respect for their tradition, culture and religion. That was how the Palestinians had come to Jordan and that was why they were welcome. They were part of the Arab family and would continue to be welcome, even though her country would remain the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, until they had regained their right to self-determination within their own borders.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.