

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOBHY (Egypt)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 86: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 82: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.3/34/SR.15  
22 October 1979  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 86: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)  
(A/34/357, A/34/389 and Corr.1, A/34/499)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (A/34/18;  
A/C.3/34/L.6, L.7 and L.8)(continued)

1. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6 had attempted to display a spirit of compromise, and had accepted the amendment proposed by Sweden to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution with a slight change to which the representative of Sweden had agreed. The text of paragraph 4 thus read: "Commends the Committee for continuing to focus its attention on the just cause of peoples struggling against colonialism, oppression and occupation wherever they exist, particularly in souther Africa, as is within its mandate;".

2. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) regretted that his delegation had been unable to reach agreement with the sponsors of the draft resolution. He considered the version proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia to be ambiguous. He would prefer to add the words "within its mandate" after the words "for continuing". If that wording were not acceptable to the Committee, he would prefer the Swedish amendment. He further proposed that in paragraph 7 the words "to supply" be replaced by the words "to consider supplying".

3. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) pointed out that, with the proposed United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4, the expressions "within its mandate" and "as is within its mandate" would occur in the same sentence.

4. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) endorsed the comments made by the Yugoslav representative.

5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom presupposed the deletion, at the end of paragraph 4 as revised by the draft resolution's sponsors, of the words "as is within its mandate".

6. Mrs. SIBAL (India), supported by Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) and Mr. NYAMEKYE (Ghana), thought that that should be stated expressly. She asked that it be clearly understood that the United Kingdom amendment was replacing the revised text proposed by the sponsors.

7. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that that was indeed the case.

8. Mr. DANОВI (Italy) and Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) asked whether the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative referred to the whole of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6, or merely to the text of paragraph 4, as revised by the draft resolution's sponsors.

9. The CHAIRMAN indicated that the amendment referred to paragraph 4, as revised by the sponsors.

/...

10. Mr. NYIRONGO (Zambia) suggested that it might be better to proceed to a vote on the draft resolution submitted by the sponsors, before voting on the amendments.
11. The CHAIRMAN reminded the representative of Zambia that, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, any amendments to a draft resolution had to be voted on before the draft resolution as a whole.
12. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) read out his amendment again.
13. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, under rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, "A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of the proposal". The United Kingdom representative could not, therefore, merely read out a new text. He had to propose the deletion or addition of a particular work, or the replacement of one word by another.
14. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) and Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED VALL (Mauritania) felt that the remarks of the United Kingdom representative were clear, but that they could have been more explicit.
15. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Ghana) regretted that the United Kingdom representative had not submitted his amendment in writing, so as to enable the Committee to see more readily what was involved.
16. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to a vote on the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4.
17. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she would have liked to propose a subamendment to the United Kingdom amendment, whereby the words "within its mandate" would be replaced by the words "in accordance with article 15 of the Convention", since the Committee's mandate arose from that article.
18. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Morocco not to insist on submitting her subamendment, since he had already suggested that the Committee proceed to a vote.
19. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) withdrew her subamendment.
20. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives who so wished to explain their vote on the United Kingdom amendment before the vote.
21. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, as a sponsor of the revised text of the draft resolution, he would vote against the United Kingdom amendment.
22. Mr. NSAHLAI (United Republic of Cameroon) regretted that the compromise text suggested by the draft resolution's sponsors had not been adopted by consensus, and would therefore vote against the United Kingdom amendment.
23. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Ghana) said that, although normally he would not have voted against an amendment specifying that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination should carry out a task within its mandate, he would vote against the United Kingdom amendment because of the strong opposition from certain delegations, notably from the draft resolution's sponsors.

24. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden), Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that they would vote for the United Kingdom amendment, which in English was clearer than the text proposed by the sponsors.
25. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria), Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin), Mr. OBADI (Democratic Yemen) and Mr. BEKELE (Ethiopia) said that they would vote against the United Kingdom amendment, since it did not take into account the revised text proposed by the draft resolution's sponsors, which had been arrived at after negotiations.
26. Mr. FAURIS (France) thought that the Committee on the elimination of Racial Discrimination could only act within the mandate entrusted to it. He would vote for the United Kingdom amendment, which seemed to him to express the Committee's opinion more clearly.
27. Mr. DANOVI (Italy) said that he would vote for the United Kingdom amendment, which seemed to him to be clearer. However, he did not think that it was for the General Assembly to decide what fell within the mandate of CERD, and he would therefore have liked the representative of Morocco to maintain her subamendment.
28. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4.
29. The United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4 was rejected by 68 votes to 31, with 14 abstentions.
30. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of the United Kingdom maintained his amendment to paragraph 7, which would replace the words "to supply" by the words "to consider supplying".
31. A recorded vote was taken on the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 7.
32. The United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 7 was rejected by 64 votes to 25, with 22 abstentions.
33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution, as revised by the sponsors and as introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia.
34. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia), speaking on a point of order, asked the Secretary of the Committee to read out the changes made in paragraphs 8 and 10.
35. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 8 had been revised to read: "... and protection of the rights of every person, group of persons or national or ethnic minority, as well as full protection of the rights of migrant workers, by preventing any practice of racial discrimination". Paragraph 10 had been revised to read: "Notes with due attention decision 1 (XX) of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination regarding the future meetings of the Committee and requests the Secretary-General in this connexion to explore the possibility of providing necessary assistance for the holding of such meetings in developing countries, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session".

36. At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6.
37. Paragraph 6 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.
38. Draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6, as revised, was adopted without a vote.
39. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said that his country objected to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution because, as a State party to the Convention, it had for long made it a policy to omit any reference to race from its reports to CERD. It would therefore be unable to supply any information on the demographic composition of its population.
40. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus although it had reservations about paragraph 2, concerning the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, for reasons that were well known to the Third Committee.
41. His delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 6 because it considered that the inclusion of references to political issues which were within the competence of other United Nations organs was unjustified and exceeded the mandate of CERD.
42. If paragraph 10 had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained because it was not a member of CERD.
43. Lastly, if the draft resolution had not included a number of superfluous references and had simply endorsed the provisions of the Convention, his delegation would have supported it without reservations.
44. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom), referring to paragraphs 4 and 7 of the draft resolution, said that obviously neither the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination nor the General Assembly was empowered to change the mandate of CERD, which was spelt out in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.
45. His delegation had requested a vote on paragraph 6 for reasons of principle, as it had done in the case of a similar paragraph concerning the situation in Cyprus in the draft resolution adopted on the same question at the preceding session, because it believed that CERD should not concern itself with political issues, much less make recommendations of a political nature to the General Assembly.
46. His delegation's statement was in addition to the one that would be made subsequently on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community.
47. Mr. WIESNER (Austria) said that he objected to paragraphs 4 and 7 of the draft resolution because the mandate of CERD had been laid down in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and could under no circumstances be changed by the General Assembly.

48. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if it had been put to a vote, despite its objections to paragraphs 4 and 7. As many delegations had pointed out, the mandate of CERD could only be changed by States parties to the Convention, and not by the General Assembly. Despite those reservations, Sweden would be prepared to supply CERD with information on the demographic composition of its population as requested in paragraph 7.

49. Mrs. PADUA (Portugal) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution but reserved its position on paragraphs 4, 6 and 7.

50. Mrs. DINC MEN (Turkey) said that her country's position on the Middle East question was well known. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey had stated recently in the General Assembly, a just and lasting peace could not be established until the Arab territories occupied by Israel and the Arab sector of Jerusalem had been liberated and the rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent State, had been recognized.

51. However, her delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution because it did not consider that CERD was empowered to deal with political issues.

52. Her delegation had voted in favour of the United Kingdom amendments to paragraphs 4 and 7, which were consistent with its position on the question of CERD's mandate.

53. Mrs. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6 by a consensus in which her delegation had joined. However, she regretted that some paragraphs of the draft resolution drew the attention of CERD to matters which were not within its original mandate. CERD was responsible for ensuring that States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination were duly fulfilling their obligations at the national level. It was for that reason that New Zealand would have preferred the adoption of the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4 explicitly inviting CERD to adhere to its mandate.

54. New Zealand objected to paragraph 6 even though, at the preceding session, it had supported resolution 33/102 dealing with the same question and containing a similar paragraph. The second part of the paragraph, in particular, was open to serious reservations because of its explicit reference to political situations.

55. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that the delegations of the nine States members of the European Community had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6 because they supported the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

56. However, as those delegations had indicated at previous sessions, the General Assembly should not be asked to approve decisions of CERD or to highlight certain of its activities. It was for that reason that they would have abstained from voting if separate votes had been taken on paragraphs 4 and 7. CERD was a fully independent body established by the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and not a subsidiary organ of the United Nations, as the Committee itself had been at pains to maintain. The delegations of the nine States members of the European Community hoped that, when a draft resolution on the subject

(Mr. O'Donovan, Ireland)

was being prepared at the next session, full account would be taken of the views of representatives of all regional groups. Those delegations emphasized that it did not fall within the competence of CERD or of the General Assembly to impose on States parties obligations that were not provided for in the Convention.

57. Mr. SABUSHIMIKE (Burundi) said that his delegation had unintentionally failed to vote for the amendment to paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6.

58. Mrs. WELLS (Australia) said she agreed with the views expressed by other delegations regarding the mandate of CERD, which the General Assembly was in no way competent to change.

59. Her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, and hoped that the members of CERD would take due note of the discussions in the Third Committee on their work.

60. Miss KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus despite its objections to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. It had voted for the amendment to paragraph 4 and wished that it had been adopted.

61. Mrs. AKAMUTSU (Japan) said that her delegation had reservations regarding paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, even though it had joined in the consensus.

62. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the adoption of the three draft resolutions on racial discrimination, which testified to the desire of the United Nations to combat racial discrimination more effectively, particularly in southern Africa, and thus achieve the objectives of the Decade. By adopting those resolutions, the Committee was appealing to all States which had not yet done so to become parties to 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. The importance of draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.5 and A/C.3/34/L.6 was all the more evident because they dealt with the intensification of measures to combat apartheid and racial discrimination in general.

63. With regard to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, his delegation had already said in its statement of 3 October 1979 that, in its report, CERD should give a more precise and more detailed account of the work of its sessions. His delegation was grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.6 for having proposed a wording that was acceptable to the Third Committee as a whole. With regard to paragraph 10, concerning the possibility of holding meetings away from United Nations Headquarters, he drew attention to resolution 2609 (XXIV), paragraph 10, which stated that United Nations bodies might hold sessions away from their established headquarters when a Government issuing an invitation for a session to be held within its territory had agreed to defray the actual additional costs directly or indirectly involved.

/...

64. Mr. MASIMBE (Malawi) reserved his position regarding paragraphs 2, 6 and 7 of the draft resolution, and drew attention in that connexion to the statement made in the General Assembly on the preceding day by the Chairman of the Malawian delegation.

65. Mr. DESKER (Singapore) said that, in his view, the references made in paragraph 6 were not in accordance with the mandate of CERD, as defined in the Convention, although he fully agreed with the substance of that paragraph.

66. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations wishing to exercise the right of reply to do so before the consideration of item 86 was concluded.

66a. Mrs. BIHI (Somalia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Abyssinia, now known as Ethiopia, had had the audacity to ascribe to Somalia the conditions prevailing in Abyssinia and the atrocities to which its people were daily subjected. In fact, everyone was aware of the real situation in Abyssinia. As the British Review of Arab Affairs had said in its issue of 10 August 1979, intellectuals and professional people, government officials, writers and teachers made up 95 per cent of those now held in jails in Ethiopia. There were a total of 31,500 jails with approaching 2 million men and women held in them. The Cuban Government was now advising Ethiopia on the extension of the prison system. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the entire country had been turned into a vast prison camp.

67. According to reports in the international press and from Amnesty International, Ethiopian Student Unions in the West and other organizations concerned with human rights violations, the blood-thirsty puppet régime of Addis Ababa was one of the most barbaric in existence, even compared with the apartheid régime of South Africa. It would take too long to list all the acts of barbarism, such as public hangings, murders and colonial wars against the peoples of Western Somalia, Abbo, Eritrea and Tigre. It was indeed ironic that the representative of such a Government should raise his voice in the world body and cast stones at its neighbours. Cheap insults levelled at a peace-loving country could not redeem the Addis Ababa régime or justify the criminal deeds of Mengistu and those whose hands were stained with the blood of the people of Western Somalia, Abbo and Eritrea and of the entire population of Ethiopia. The international community must not be deceived; it must shoulder its responsibilities towards those unfortunate peoples and bring the Abyssinian colonial régime to its senses.

68. When the representative of the Mengistu régime had talked about Somalia's expansionist and racist policy and about the Masai, Kikuyu and other minorities, he had no doubt been confusing Somalia with his own country, since it was well known that the Somalis were a homogeneous people with one language and one religion. She challenged the representative of the fascist régime in Addis Ababa to deny those historical facts. In attempting to show the existence of racial problems in Somalia, he had gone so far as to mention the Masai, supposedly an ethnic group in Somalia. There was on the other hand irrefutable evidence that the Abyssinian Empire had been founded and always dominated by the small Amhara ethnic group to which Mengistu himself belonged. Since when had Abyssinia become a black African country? Had it not always claimed to belong to the Semitic race? Africans did not need to be certified by the representatives of Addis Ababa in order to establish their authenticity.

(Mrs. Bihi, Somalia)

69. With regard to the so-called claims of Somalia to the territory of others, its position had been made clear on numerous occasions in the United Nations, OAU and other international fora. It would try the Committee's patience if she went over the historical development of the question and enumerated the wars of conquest waged by Abyssinia and its successive annexations of Somali territory and territories belonging to other States in the region. It sufficed to say that it had not been Somalia but Abyssinia which in the fifteenth century had invaded neighbouring territories and annexed them, which in the eighteenth century, with the connivance of European colonial Powers, had again invaded and annexed neighbouring territories, which in the twentieth century had on two different occasions annexed still more territories and which was currently engaged in two bloody colonial wars on two different fronts with the assistance of Cuban troops and other mercenary groups and with arms supplied by a super-Power and its allies. Somalia had, as a matter of fact, never annexed any territory belonging to other countries, nor had it ever entertained such intentions. One might, however, legitimately ask what Mengistu and his clique were going to do when the foreign troops left Ethiopia. It was a foregone conclusion that the oppressed peoples would continue their struggle to free themselves from Abyssinian colonialism until they won the final victory. The liberation forces of Western Somalia and Abbo had defeated the colonial forces and had liberated over 90 per cent of their territory when the said super-Power and its satellites came to the rescue of the colonial troops. That intervention of forces from outside the continent explained the temporary setback to the liberation forces. In the light of those facts, the threats of the Addis Ababa régime came as a complete surprise.

70. Somalia supported and would support all peoples fighting for independence and self-determination both in Africa and elsewhere, and cheap Abyssinian propaganda would not deter it from doing so, for it was convinced that colonialism was not predicated on pigmentation of the skin. As a representative of an African liberation front had declared at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Havana, colonialism was inter-continental and was not the exclusive province of the white race.

71. Mr. BEKELE (Ethiopia), answering the representative of Somalia, said that he had merely quoted the President of Somalia, who had asserted that the population of his country was Somali and not African like the Masai or the Kikuyu, an assertion that proved the Somali Government's racist attitude. That Government had for a long time been making propaganda to promote the thesis that the Somali people was a homogeneous one, whereas in fact it was composed of various tribes and clans.

72. As for the references made by the representative of Somalia to events going back to the eighteenth and fifteenth centuries, perhaps she needed to be reminded that her country had struggled for centuries for its independence and that the various clans that composed it had hastened to cede portions of territory to all the interested colonial Powers, thus enabling them to infiltrate Ethiopia. In the face of that unacceptable situation, Ethiopia had had to take a firm stand and battle the Somali clans repeatedly in the course of history, especially in the nineteenth century. It was clear that Ethiopia had already been a unified country at that

/...

(Mr. Bekele, Ethiopia)

period, and Somalia's leaders would do well to convince themselves of that. They would naturally pursue their policy of aggression, but as his delegation had already said when exercising its right of reply at the preceding meeting, they could rest assured that Ethiopia would put an end once and for all to their expansionist aims.

73. As for the accusations made against the Revolutionary Government of Addis Ababa, that Government had obviously never expected its enemies to speak well of the revolution. He could go into details on how the revolution was bettering the condition of the masses who had been the victims of oppression, but the members of the Committee, some of whom had been able to ascertain for themselves what the situation in Ethiopia was, would draw their own conclusions.

74. Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed indignation at the fact that the representative of Somalia had once again mentioned Cuba. That representative seemed to find it difficult to admit the defeat her country had sustained at the time of its attempted aggression against neighbouring States. It was deplorable that one of the least advanced countries of Africa was devoting its meagre resources to aggressive forays beyond its borders which endangered the security of neighbouring States and of the entire continent. It was equally lamentable that within the Committee the Somali delegation should persist in attacking Cuba, vainly attempting to distort the attitude of the Cuban Government, which, faithful to its principles of solidarity, had given and was giving assistance to various sovereign countries that had expressly requested it. Each time the Somali delegation made a reference to Cuba, she would find herself, much to her regret, obliged to comment on it.

AGENDA ITEM 82: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/34/367 and Add.1, A/34/499, A/34/357, A/34/389 and Corr.1).

75. Mr. VAN BOVEN (Director, Division of Human Rights), introducing agenda item 82, said that the principle of self-determination was one of the core principles of the United Nations Charter and of modern international law. Furthermore, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights guaranteed to all peoples the right to self-determination, by virtue of which they freely determined their political status and freely pursued their economic, social and cultural development. Despite United Nations action for universal decolonization and for the independence of peoples still under trusteeship, there still remained in 1979 some enclaves of colonialism and alien domination. Decolonization and self-determination were dealt with in various organs of the United Nations. The question of self-determination had also been considered from the human-rights, humanitarian and social points of view by the Third Committee, the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and in other human-rights organs such as the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Human Rights Committee.

(Mr. Van Boven)

76. Those organs which, since 1968, had examined the matter from the human-rights, humanitarian and social points of view generally followed the same methods and pursued the same objectives: they made efforts to support the activities of other organs dealing with political and economic self-determination; they pursued complementary approaches and programmes in order to bring about genuine self-determination and to tackle the root causes of denials of self-determination, such as economic and military assistance given to colonial and racist régimes; they emphasized the close interrelationship between self-determination and human rights; they identified the importance which should be attached to the various dimensions of self-determination (political, legal, economic, social, cultural and humanitarian); and, lastly, they elucidated the concept of self-determination and its status in international law.

77. The United Nations had contributed greatly to the struggle for universal self-determination by recognizing that it was indispensable for self-determination to be genuine not only in the political and legal senses but also in the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian senses. Stress had been placed upon the fact that self-determination must be based on the free and full development of every human being, who must enjoy full respect for his or her rights. When setting up its programme on human rights, the United Nations had attached importance to the need to realize the new international economic order, accompanied by new human and social orders, an emphasis closely related to the universal realization of self-determination. Freedom of information and the establishment of a new information order were also closely intertwined with self-determination. At the same time, however, it would not be enough to demand national rights without ensuring human rights within nations.

78. Since 1968, the Third Committee, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and various other human-rights organs had gone far in dealing with the subject of self-determination. Certain fundamental studies had been prepared and various pronouncements had been made within the United Nations setting out the law on that subject. In the future, a way should be found to define more sharply the human-rights, humanitarian and social dimensions of self-determination.

79. He drew the Committee's attention to some recent decisions of the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. At its thirty-fifth session, the Commission on Human Rights had adopted resolution 2 (XXXV) and resolution 3 (XXXV), in which the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial and alien domination had been forcefully reaffirmed. Furthermore, in a resolution adopted on 5 December 1979, the Sub-Commission had affirmed in particular that the right to self-determination was a well-established principle of international law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and recognized by the relevant United Nations resolutions. It urged all States Members and organs of the United Nations, as well as specialized agencies and other international organizations, to enable negotiations to begin immediately between Israel and the Palestinian people with a view to restoring all lost rights in accordance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations.

/...

80. Mr. WANG Jiechen (China) said that the world situation had changed considerably since the adoption in 1973 of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He referred to the recent World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and to the sixteenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at which the African States had, inter alia, taken decisions on the establishment of Pan-African defence forces and on increasing their assistance to the national liberation movements and to the front-line States in southern Africa.

81. He observed that the various national liberation movements in southern Africa had continued to gain strength and had dealt increasingly heavy blows to the white racists in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. In response, the racists had stepped up repression within their own frontiers and armed incursions into the neighbouring African countries. Facts had shown that the existence of the racist régime in South Africa and the racist forces in Southern Rhodesia constituted the fundamental obstacle to any settlement of the situation in Zimbabwe and in Namibia.

82. The racists, who resorted to political tricks to maintain their domination, would, like all reactionary régimes throughout the world, never relinquish their position of their own accord. The peoples of southern Africa would finally throw off the racist yoke only by continuously strengthening all forms of struggle, especially armed struggle. All justice-loving countries and peoples should actively support them, and impose sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.

83. The Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples could also count on ever-growing support in their just struggle, although the Israeli authorities, with the support of the super-Powers, remained adamant in their policies of aggression and expansion. The United Nations, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, should assume a more important role in the quest for a just over-all settlement in the Middle East.

84. The Chinese people and Government strongly condemned the reactionary policies of the racists of southern Africa. They firmly supported the struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania and of the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples fighting to regain their lands and to establish a sovereign State.

85. The resolutions imposing an arms embargo against South Africa must be implemented, and the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia extended to South Africa. The peoples engaged in the struggle and all peace-loving peoples would finally triumph if they strengthened their unity and were able to thwart the manoeuvres of the super-Powers, particularly the self-styled "natural ally" of the African and Arab peoples.

86. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the general situation continued to deteriorate, since many peoples in the world still lived under the yoke of imperialism, foreign occupation, domination and exploitation. The Committee had once again found it necessary to include an item on self-determination in its agenda for the year.

(Mr. Al-Hussamy, Syrian Arab Republic)

87. Throughout history the colonial Powers had paid no heed to the human rights of the peoples which they had colonized; on the contrary, they had flouted human rights by systematically discriminating against the indigenous population in such fields as housing, education and employment. They had sought to stifle the civilization and culture of the indigenous inhabitants, seized their lands and their goods, and even resorted to armed force to exterminate, so to speak the population.

88. But history also taught that enslaved peoples had always fought against imperialism by every means at their disposal. Their determination, their sacrifices and the support of public opinion had always enabled them to break free from their shackles sooner or later. He recognized the immense role played by the United Nations in the struggle for self-determination. Nevertheless, many peoples were not able to give full expression to their national sentiment and free themselves from the domination of the colonial Powers, which were economically very powerful and technologically advanced, especially in the field of armaments.

89. Deplorable as it was that certain Members of the Organization continued to encourage aggression by providing assistance, including military assistance, to the colonial régimes, it was still more deplorable that some of those countries were members of the Security Council and therefore committed, under the Charter, to reaffirming human rights and guaranteeing international peace and security.

90. His delegation deeply concerned at the worsening lot of the colonized peoples of Palestine, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, appealed to the international community to support all those peoples in their struggle. It called upon States collaborating with the racist régimes to stop that co-operation immediately. The United Nations would then be able to help the Palestinian people and the peoples of southern Africa give expression to their national identity and fully exercise their sovereignty, which would allow their creativity to develop and would bring prosperity to the whole world.

91. He stressed that the colonized peoples had never accepted any solution other than self-determination. He was concerned at the manoeuvres of certain States which, by suggesting sham solutions, wished to undermine the international community's support for those peoples' struggle. As examples, he cited the sham elections and spurious constitution imposed on Zimbabwe and the attempts to impose on the Palestinian people the "autonomy" stipulated in the Camp David accords.

92. His delegation supported the struggle of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland and to exercise its right of self-determination by establishing an independent State in Palestine. It rejected any separate bargain struck at the expense of the Palestinian people. The Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of that people, had the right to participate in any international action aimed at bringing about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That would be possible only if the Israeli forces withdrew from the occupied Arab territories and if the Palestinian people was able to exercise its sovereignty.

/...

(Mr. Al-Hussamy, Syrian Arab Republic)

93. It was essential, above all, for every human being to be able to express himself, free from the fear of torture or other forms of coercion. The Third Committee had a particular duty to watch over the human rights of people who continued to suffer discrimination, injustice and exploitation. His delegation was convinced that the Committee would take a clear stand on the matter and adopt resolutions through which the determination of oppressed and colonized peoples could be strengthened.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.