

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL
E/CM.4/1984/SR.22
27 February 1984
Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Fortieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 21 February 1984, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Kooijmans (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

The right of peoples to self-determination and its application to peoples under colonial or alien domination or foreign occupation (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.84-15375

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

THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO PEOPLES UNDER COLONIAL OR ALIEN DOMINATION OR FOREIGN OCCUPATION (agenda item 9) (continued) (E/CN.4/1984/15, 41, 52, 53 and 55; E/CN.4/1984/L.9; E/CN.4/1984/NGO/14, 15, 18, 20, 23 and 26)

1. Mr. OULD-ROUIS (Observer for Algeria) said that the right of peoples to self-determination, as expressed in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, continued to be flouted and the process of decolonization obstructed in various regions of the world. The denial of the right to self-determination constituted a primary cause of conflict which threatened international peace and security. A fair and lasting peace in the Middle East would necessarily require recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the participation of their representative, the PLO.
2. In southern Africa a similar denial of self-determination to Namibia by the South African regime seemed likely to set the whole region aflame. In north-west Africa the same problem had given rise to a war which had already lasted for eight years; the situation in the Western Sahara, on the borders of Algeria, was a source of great concern to his country and a threat to the stability of the region. Two basic principles were involved: the right to self-determination and the inviolability of frontiers inherited from the colonial period. If north Africa was to develop, a fair and lasting political solution was needed to the conflict in the Western Sahara, a solution which the United Nations, OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries were earnestly seeking.
3. Meeting in Addis Ababa in June 1983, OAU had adopted by consensus a resolution comprising a peace plan based on a cease-fire in the Western Sahara, the initiation of negotiations between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Polisario Front, and the organization of a referendum without political or military constraints, by 31 December 1983. That resolution removed any doubts as to the interpretation of previous decisions by OAU on the question of Western Sahara. The African peace plan had been welcomed by the international community and, in particular, by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations General Assembly. The subsequent failure to implement the resolution had duly led to frustration among those who had helped to draft it. Hopes of a political solution had been frustrated by the refusal of Morocco to negotiate. Algeria, for its part, had constantly offered to contribute to a solution of the problem by helping the conflicting parties to initiate a dialogue which might lead to a fair and lasting solution based on the relevant decisions and resolutions of OAU and the United Nations.
4. For several years the Commission had been considering the question of Western Sahara in the light of the denial of the right of self-determination. Since its thirty-seventh session it had appealed to the conflicting parties to undertake direct negotiation, but without results. In his delegation's opinion, the Commission should join with the General Assembly in endorsing the appeal by OAU to the conflicting parties to hold negotiations aimed at a peaceful settlement, and thus contribute to the search for a solution to a conflict which violated the fundamental right of peoples to self-determination.

5. Mr. RAMLAWI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Charter of the United Nations related not only to States but also to peoples. The objective set out in Article 1 included the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. The rights of the Palestinians, of whom his organization was the legitimate representative, had been recognized by the United Nations since the 1947 resolution on the partition of Palestine, which had authorized the Palestinians to create their own State. A number of resolutions since then had linked respect for the rights of the Palestinian people and the achievement of a fair and lasting peace in the Middle East. They had spelled out those rights as the right to self-determination, the right to international sovereignty, the right to return to their homeland and the right to create an independent State.
6. By resolution 3376(XXX) the General Assembly had decided to create a Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That Committee had done outstanding work, had submitted recommendations to the Assembly and had prepared programmes of action for the Palestinian people.
7. The international community had been dealing with the question in the light of international law for almost 30 years and were unanimous in their desire to restore peace and justice to the region, but all efforts in the Security Council had been obstructed by the attitude of the United States, which felt that the interests of the international community were not in line with its own. It had used its veto to neutralize the resolution which would have enabled the Palestinian people to accede to self-determination. It had concentrated its efforts on giving unlimited support to Israel in order to enable it to achieve military superiority in the region and had promoted policies to ensure its own interests and those of Israel, not only in the context of the Arab conflict but within the international community as a whole.
8. The United States adopted a hostile policy towards countries fighting for their independence and in the Middle East it based its actions on its own concept of the Arabs and the region in general. United States and Israeli interests coincided in a desire for hegemony and expansion, and aggression against the peoples of the region. The strategic alliance between the United States and Israel served to reaffirm the former's false claims to desire peace in the region, when in fact it actually opposed any progress towards freedom. The Lebanese conflict was a flagrant demonstration of its diabolical powers. Limitless support by the United States for Israel encouraged the latter to violate the elementary principles of international law. Only that morning the Commission had heard the United States representative defend the right of peoples to self-determination while his country continued to spill blood in South Africa, Namibia, Palestine and the Caribbean.
9. The Arab States and the PLO had submitted a peace plan which had been adopted at the Fez summit meeting; it had been welcomed by the majority of countries, including Western European countries, and rejected only by the United States and Israel because it was not in line with their policy of hegemony and aggression. The rejection of all peace treaties enabled Israel to seize Palestinian land and commit atrocities in order to achieve its objectives. The intolerable nature of the situation called for action by the international community to avert the imminent dangers, which could lead to its collapse and the emergence of the law of the jungle. The Palestinian people would continue to fight with all the means open to them under the Charter of the United Nations to resist Zionist occupation and defend their right to self-determination. The entire world was on their side.

10. The Palestinians' right to self-determination had been the subject of many documents. Commission resolution 1983/3, paragraph 14, requested "the Secretary-General to make available to the Commission on Human Rights and to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities the reports, studies and publications prepared by the Division for Palestinian Rights". It was regrettable that his delegation had not been able to obtain the important studies referred to in document E/CN.4/1984/15; it hoped that they would be made available to members of the Commission for their perusal.
11. Mr. WAHPEPAH (International Indian Treaty Council) declared that history had not begun in 1492; the 98 Indian nations which his organization represented had thousands of years of history behind them.
12. With the escalation of colonialism in the western hemisphere during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the perpetuation of the political and economic relations between dominant and oppressed peoples established under colonialism was ensured as modern neo-colonialist market relations and institutions emerged. Neo-colonialism entailed the contemporary economic relationship between industrialized and third-world States, and meant that the original peoples of the western hemisphere continued to be subjected to economic and political exploitation and dependency.
13. Indian nations in North America clung to a tenuous existence as enclave nations whose lands continued to be subject to unchecked exploitation by domestic governments and multinational corporations. Their poverty, phenomenal rates of unemployment and lethal health conditions were hidden from the international community. They were subjects of a "tribal government" system to which the United States and Canadian Governments pointed with pride as proof of Indian sovereignty, although every decision made by tribal governments must be approved by officials of the colonial United States and Canadian Governments. Perhaps the United States and Canada wished to introduce an Indian stereotype. The organization he represented formed part of the resistance to that aim.
14. Despite the extreme poverty of the Indians, the United States continued to promote Indian lands for exploitation by transnational corporations. A number of laws passed by the United States Congress had resulted in the take-over of vast areas of Indian land, forced relocation and the destruction of self-sufficient communities. Those laws led to economic destabilization and interfered with the spiritual bases of the Indian nations.
15. All signatories to the Charter of the United Nations and other international instruments had international obligations, but Canada did not wish the United Nations to interfere in the "territorial integrity of a sovereign non-colonial State" (Indian peoples in Canada qualified as "States" under international law). In order to ensure that the Indian peoples had no access to international forums to assert their rights, Canada had evolved a constitutional process to give the appearance of allowing access to the legal system within Canada. There was, in fact, no direct Indian participation, and Canada's application of its colonial corpus of law was contrary to international law.
16. The consistent policy of the United States and Canada had been to diminish the land-base of Indian nations through legislation, without the consent of Indian peoples. The United States and Indian nations had signed and ratified 371 treaties to ensure that Indians could consent to change in their political, legal, economic and cultural status. That unilateral abrogation of international treaty law by national Governments, and lack of respect for the aims of international law, constituted a classic example of the denial of the right to self-determination.

17. Mr. KHERAD (Observer for Afghanistan) said that important changes had taken place in international law over the past few decades; new principles and standards had emerged and old principles and democratic institutions had been reinforced. The right of peoples to self-determination was an example of the stubborn struggle of the forces of peace when the principles of international law had been established, and comprised not only the right of peoples to liberation, but also their right to choose their own form of social and economic development. It was closely linked with the equality of rights of peoples and the principle of sovereignty, as endorsed by the United Nations in resolutions and other instruments.

18. The 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples proclaimed the need to put an end to colonialism in all its forms and stated that the colonial system was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to contemporary international law. The recognition of the right to self-determination, closely related to the struggle against oppression and for national, economic and social liberation, was of prime importance for the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as for the preservation of world peace, which could not exist while nations were subjected to oppression, exploitation, colonialism, imperialism and racism.

19. Decolonization had made rapid strides during the past generation; some two thirds of the Organization's Member States were former colonies or dependent territories. But millions of people, particularly in southern Africa, Palestine and areas of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans and the Caribbean, were still being denied the right to self-determination. United States imperialism was behind Israel's denial of the right to self-determination in the occupied Arab territories and southern Africa, and only United States support for the Pretoria regime had prevented the people of Namibia from achieving freedom and independence. In Central America, the same policy continued to threaten the sovereignty and independence of Cuba and Nicaragua, and to prevent the peoples of El Salvador and Puerto Rico from achieving self-determination. United States armed intervention in Grenada and the crushing of the progressive democratic regime there constituted a flagrant violation of the right to self-determination. And the intrigues against the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which was struggling to repair the devastation caused by the Pol Pot regime, likewise violated that right.

20. Despite the growing awareness of peoples everywhere of their rights and their strength, the forces of imperialism in the United States and elsewhere were stepping up their efforts to revive the "cold war", interfering directly or indirectly in independent States' internal affairs and seeking by all possible means to hinder the progress of national liberation movements, in order to prolong colonial domination and exploitation. They did not hesitate to subvert and destabilize lawful Governments, using the weapons of propaganda, political pressure and economic measures, in order to reverse the revolutionary process and the social progress of peoples.

21. Since the heroic and patriotic people of Afghanistan had succeeded in their struggle to overthrow an unjust, medieval system of exploitation and despotism, the resultant transfer of power to the majority population had displeased the forces of imperialism and reaction associated with the former regime. Those forces, in the United States and allied countries, had immediately released an undeclared war against Afghanistan, bestowing funds and weapons on the forces

of feudal counter-revolution, which had begun a revanchist campaign under the banner of religion and operated from a chain of military bases and training camps in Pakistan. Their activities had included armed incursions by terrorists and mercenaries, which had caused many civilians to flee from their homes. The Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had appealed for assistance to the Soviet Union, pursuant to article 4 of the 1978 Treaty of Friendship and Article 51 of the Charter, in order to defend national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

22. The United States was undoubtedly the prime mover of the large-scale aggression against Afghanistan, which had resulted in acts of subversion, terrorism and pillage against peaceful civilians and the destruction of hospitals, schools and bridges, the aim being to reverse the revolutionary process and restore the forces of reaction to power. The sums devoted to subversive action against Afghanistan by the United States had been estimated at \$US 1 billion and it had been reported in the United States press that assistance to counter-revolutionaries had been increased in 1983 as a result of a decision taken by the United States President. Such action, which amounted to an undeclared war against a sovereign State, flagrantly violated the Charter and international law. Those vain efforts to alter the course of history could only threaten peace and security. The people of Afghanistan posed no threat to anyone, wishing only to build a society free from exploitation of man by man and secure in freedom and independence. The true threat, as was well known, came from the forces of imperialism in the United States and its NATO allies.

23. The situation had been accurately appraised at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. Afghanistan, despite all the calumnies directed at its revolutionary society, was resolved to pursue its chosen independent and democratic course, to secure economic progress and to improve the lot of the working population. Any impartial observer was bound to note the enormous strides already made, despite the effects of the counter-revolutionaries' undeclared war against the Afghan people. Local populations were now able to participate fully in administration and economic, social, political and cultural activities. The people's organs of power had been strengthened, and the political and social bases of government had been expanded and consolidated. The National Patriotic Front had been reinforced, in compliance with the people's wishes.

24. A great deal of hypocritical concern had been expressed about the plight of the so-called Afghan refugees. However, Afghanistan's Revolutionary Council had offered an unconditional general amnesty, under which all genuine refugees were free to return; document A/38/559 contained the appeal by the President of the Revolutionary Council to Afghans abroad. Afghanistan, having a peaceful foreign policy, was sincerely engaged in negotiations with Pakistan, through the good offices of the Secretary-General's personal representative. The latter's efforts had been recognized by the Afghan Minister for Foreign Affairs when addressing the General Assembly at the thirty-eighth session. The Minister had also stated that an end to armed intervention in Afghanistan from Pakistan must be the primary object of the negotiations, together with firm international guarantees to enable Afghan refugees to return to their homes. That was clearly provided for in the Afghan proposals of 14 May 1980 and 24 August 1981.

25. Afghanistan pursued a policy of independence, peace and non-alignment, and sought friendly relations with its neighbours and all other nations, based on peaceful coexistence, non-interference in other countries' internal affairs, and respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and national independence. It observed the principles of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and supported the struggle of peoples against colonialism, imperialism, racism and apartheid, and for self-determination and independence. It called on the international community to take more effective steps in furtherance of that struggle.

26. Mr. VILLA (World Peace Council) said that the right of peoples to self-determination comprised not only the right to be free from all forms of colonial domination and foreign occupation or racism, but also the right of peoples to rid themselves of oppressive dictatorships and the right, recognized in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to rebel against tyranny and oppression. It also included the right, reflected in the Algiers Declaration of 1976, to be governed by a democratic regime representing all citizens without distinction as to race, sex, belief or colour. That right was also recognized in article 1 of the International Covenants.

27. The right of external self-determination had been clearly defined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other international instruments. The concept of internal self-determination, however, was less clear, although it was enshrined in the International Covenants and had been applied in several instances in Latin America.

28. In 1979, the Organization of American States (OAS) had taken the historic step of declaring the Government of a member State - the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua - unlawful because of its gross violations of its own people's human rights. The Nicaraguan people's struggle, under the Sandinista National Liberation Front, for the right to internal self-determination had been deemed lawful. Likewise, the Franco-Mexican Declaration of 28 August 1981 had confirmed the Salvadorian people's right to political action aimed at establishing a new internal order, and had recognized the representative political force of the FMLN and FDR national liberation movements. The spirit of that Declaration had been subsequently reflected annually in General Assembly and Commission resolutions - for example, Assembly resolution 38/101, which explicitly upheld the Salvadorian people's right to external and internal self-determination. The Assembly and the Commission had likewise upheld the rights of the peoples of Chile and Guatemala.

29. The World Peace Council condemned violations of such rights. In particular, it condemned the violation perpetuated in Grenada as a result of invasion by foreign forces led by the United States. It was to be hoped that the Commission would condemn that invasion, reject the reasons given for it by the United States Administration and urge the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from Grenada.

30. Similarly, his organization condemned the continuing aggression by the United States and Honduras against Nicaragua. It supported the Salvadorian and Guatemalan peoples' struggle, under their national liberation movements, for self-determination and freedom from oppressive dictatorships. The Kissinger Commission's proposals, which would substantially increase United States intervention in Central America, constituted a serious violation of the right to self-determination in that region. The Commission should call on the President of the United States to modify his interventionist and militarist policy in the region and accept a

political solution safeguarding the full exercise of the Central American peoples' right to self-determination. His organization supported the peace proposal recently put forward by FMLN-FDR in El Salvador, aimed at installing a government with broad participation.

31. Ms. DUNBAR C. TIZ (Women's International League for Peace and Freedom) said that WILPF had organized and participated in investigations of human rights violations in Central America, including those committed in El Salvador and under the former Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua. She had recently been a member of an independent delegation of women which had made a fact-finding tour of El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua. On 5 January 1984, the delegation had issued a consensus statement concerning the situation prevailing in those countries and the denial of self-determination there.

32. With regard to Honduras, the delegation's report noted that the United States maintained a major military presence, conducting joint manoeuvres with Honduran troops, and training Salvadorian forces and counter-revolutionaries, whose core consisted of former members of the Somoza National Guard seeking to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. Resources were thus being diverted from programmes to promote Honduran citizens' well-being, and the enhanced militarization, designed to maintain an increasingly repressive military Government in power, was sabotaging the democratic process.

33. In Nicaragua, the Sandinistas, an indigenous movement, had overthrown the Somoza dictatorship in 1979 and continued to enjoy enormous support. Despite certain allegations, the country was oriented towards neither the United States nor the Soviet Union, and its evolution was for the Nicaraguan people to determine. The report noted that the Sandinistas were making impressive reforms in education, health care and agrarian reform, and concluded that intervention in Nicaragua was a disastrous mistake and was causing incalculable human suffering. The Nicaraguan Government had expressed willingness to negotiate peaceful solutions of regional conflicts, both through the Contadora process and with the United States direct, in matters such as non-alignment in international relations, a regional arms freeze, the removal of all foreign bases and military advisers, and international verification of such measures. WILPF was convinced, on the basis of that report and other information, that the United States military intervention violated the Nicaraguan people's right to internal self-determination.

34. In connection with El Salvador, the delegation had concluded that United States aid to the Government had not only failed to achieve military victory but was obstructing democracy. The elections scheduled for March 1984 would achieve little until activities such as those of the death-squads were eliminated and conditions were created for the involvement of all political forces in progress towards a political settlement prior to elections.

35. The delegation had also recommended support for the Contadora process in preference to military solutions. The right of self-determination for Central America's peoples was a prerequisite for peace in the region and for ending the human rights violations being committed in El Salvador by government security forces and caused in Honduras and Nicaragua by United States intervention.

36. Ms. GRAF (International League for the Rights and Liberation of Peoples) said that her organization was interested in all matters relating to the right of peoples to self-determination - a right on which all other rights depended. The League's devotion to that right and consequent rights had been reflected in such instruments as the Universal Declaration of Peoples' Rights, proclaimed in Algiers in 1976.

37. The League urged the Commission to take further action in support of the Sahrawi people, which, despite many Assembly, Commission and OAU resolutions, continued to be denied its right to self-determination, in defiance of the principles of the Charter, international law and international human rights instruments. The history of Western Sahara was well known. The colonial war unleashed by Morocco against the Sahrawi people nine years before was not only an act of aggression within the meaning of General Assembly resolution 2425 (XXIII), but a flagrant violation of article 1 of the International Covenants. Morocco's colonial policy was depriving the Sahrawi people of its inalienable right to self-determination. The entire African community desired the initiation of a peace-making process in order to end the sufferings caused by that war. Resolution AHG/Res.104(XIX), adopted by OAU at the nineteenth ordinary session of its Assembly of Heads of State or Government, and subsequently approved by the General Assembly, called for direct negotiations between Morocco and the Polisario Front for the purposes of declaring a cease-fire and holding a referendum under OAU and United Nations auspices, and for the establishment of a joint OAU/United Nations peace-keeping force. Because of Morocco's negative attitude, however, the first phase had not yet been put into effect. The Moroccan Government had refused to deal with the Polisario Front and had even drawn up a strategy of consolidation, which was liable to involve other neighbouring States in the conflict. Morocco thus bore full political, legal and moral responsibility for obstructing the peace plan and preventing the Sahrawi people from exercising its right to self-determination, as recognized in all relevant international forums.

38. The International community should take action accordingly. The Commission, which had the task of promoting respect for the right to self-determination pursuant to the Charter and other relevant international instruments, should denounce those responsible for violating that right and support the African community's peace plan, which alone could safeguard respect for fundamental human rights in the region concerned.

39. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had marked the recognition of the need for the immediate and unconditional ending of colonialism in all its forms, and had given the international community the major task of ensuring the elimination of that phenomenon. The Commission could not shirk that task as it had a direct duty to promote action to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism, which still oppressed millions of people.

40. Consideration of the agenda item, which had been before the Commission for many years, must focus on the speedy implementation of the Declaration. There was every opportunity of carrying out that important task. The achievements of the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the collapse of the colonial empires showed that the aspirations of the oppressed peoples for national liberation could overcome all obstacles. International solidarity, for which the socialist countries were working, was paramount. Colonialism was doomed to failure. The remaining manifestations of colonialism were a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and were incompatible with the concept of human rights. There could be no justification for that abhorrent phenomenon, which was an affront to the dignity of the human being. Vestiges

of colonialism and racism persisted because aggressive forces disregarded the will of the people and flouted international law and world public opinion. The Commission had a duty to do everything possible to prevent the colonizers and their supporters from erecting obstacles to the liberation of territories.

41. A major focus of colonialism and racism remained in southern Africa. Many delegations had rightly observed that the abhorrent system of apartheid in South Africa and the unlawful occupation of Namibia constituted a crime against humanity and a challenge to the United Nations. The South African racists were violating the rights of the South African and Namibian peoples to self-determination and denying their aspirations to freedom and independence. The Pretoria regime had institutionalized a policy of terror against the indigenous population - a policy that included arbitrary arrest, torture and murder of freedom-fighters - and it was pursuing a policy of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and other neighbouring States, thereby endangering world peace. The racist minority in South Africa maintained its dominant position by force and used its military might to oppress the indigenous population and bring death and destruction to neighbouring States. Its military machine had been created and strengthened by a constant flow of assistance from certain Western States, particularly the United States of America, through transnational corporations and as deliberate State policy. The military, economic and political assistance given to the apartheid regime enabled the racists to continue to oppress the indigenous people and keep them in slavery. The States giving such assistance were able to exploit cheap labour and raw materials and to reap vast profits. The United States Administration had assured the South African regime that it was its historical ally. That assurance, which was a direct threat to the African people and a challenge to world public opinion, enabled the United States to use South Africa as a means of destabilizing neighbouring States. The manoeuvres of certain members of the so-called "contact group", which were plotting to bring about a neo-colonialist "settlement" of the Namibian problem, had been unmasked. The Namibian people were expected to remain patient in the face of new obstacles placed in the way of their freedom and independence.

42. Regardless of their claims to the contrary, the colonizers had not withdrawn voluntarily from colonized territories. The more energetically the international community demonstrated its solidarity with the South African and Namibian peoples in their struggle for independence, the sooner would those peoples secure their liberation. The United Nations should therefore press its legitimate demand for the complete international isolation of the apartheid regime.

43. His country had consistently supported the demands of the African States for the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with chapter VII of the Charter, as a means of forcing the Pretoria regime to cease its unlawful occupation of Namibia and to put an end to its criminal system of apartheid. The message of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the USSR to the countries and peoples of Africa on the occasion of African Independence Day on 25 May 1983 had stated that the Soviet Union had consistently supported the peoples of the African continent in their struggle against colonialism, racism and apartheid, and that it would continue to render all possible support to the liberation struggle of the Namibian and South African patriots who, under the leadership of SWAPO and the ANC, were defending their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

44. It was intolerable that a number of territories in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans were still under the colonialist yoke and that the administering Powers were endeavouring to impede the economic and social development of those territories. Contrary to the aims of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the interests of international peace and security, those Powers had established military bases on the territories from which to attack independent States and national liberation movements. The United Kingdom continued to hold a number of colonial territories, while the United States had turned the island of Diego Garcia into a strategic base for rapid-deployment forces directed against the countries of Asia and Africa. If the Powers concerned took the right to self-determination seriously, as they claimed to do, they would immediately withdraw from Diego Garcia and would return the entire Chagos Archipelago, including that island territory, to the sovereignty of Mauritius.

45. Only imperialist contempt could explain the attitude of the United States towards Micronesia, where it had embarked on a policy of annexation. Under cover of a mandate to administer that Territory, it was using the Territory solely in its own strategic interests. Micronesians were suffering from the effects of nuclear-weapon tests, and their health was impaired by environmental contamination. The United States had imposed one-sided agreements on the Trust Territory for the maintenance and expansion of its military, air and naval bases and for the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, and it intended to convert the Pacific islands into military and strategic bases for action against the countries bordering the region. The Trust Territory itself had been dismembered and its people had been deprived of their sovereign rights. The neo-colonial status which, in various guises, had been imposed on various parts of Micronesia in an unlawful attempt to interfere with the destiny of the people concerned, was reminiscent of the worst era of colonialist history. The United States had flagrantly contravened the provision of the Charter to the effect that no change might be made in the status of a Trust Territory without a specific decision by the Security Council for the purpose.

46. There had been universal condemnation of the expansionist policies of Israel which had for many years been occupying Arab lands and violating the inalienable rights of the Arab peoples, particularly the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish their own independent State. Israel was supported and encouraged in its expansionist policy by certain countries that were providing it with military and technical assistance on a massive scale. The world community had been shocked at its aggression in Lebanon, and at the acts of genocide it had perpetrated against the Palestinian people. Those acts were the direct result of the co-operation it received from the United States. Washington's aspirations had led to flagrant armed intervention in Lebanon's affairs, with the constant engagement of United States vessels and aircraft. In its support for Israeli aggression, the United States had impeded a Middle East settlement and pursued an anti-Arab policy with no regard for the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination. That policy was not only against the vital interests of the people of the region, but was also a threat to international peace and security. All peace-loving peoples had been seriously concerned about the state of world tension to which it had given rise.

47. The aggressive militarist policy pursued by the United States posed an ever-growing threat to the rights and free existence of peoples. In its endeavour to safeguard its dominant position in the world, it disregarded the interests of all other countries and peoples. It had declared various parts of the world to be "vital spheres of interest" and was pursuing a policy of diktat and threats

against independent States and national liberation movements. Its policy of militarism and interference in the internal affairs of States had taken the form of naked aggression against the small island State of Grenada, and against the freedom and independence of its people, who had consistently pursued a policy of peace and non-alignment. By that act of aggression, the United States had flagrantly violated the Charter, the norms of international relations and the rights of the Grenadian people, including their right to self-determination. The aggressor, which had cynically defied the international community, had been condemned by the United Nations, which had called for its immediate withdrawal from the island.

48. The Commission was faced with a question of principle. If it failed to condemn the arbitrary policies of the United States, no non-aligned State would be safe from interference, particularly if its domestic or foreign policy was not to Washington's liking. It was the Commission's duty to condemn United States aggression against Grenada and its continued occupation of the island, and to call for its immediate and unconditional withdrawal.

49. The silence of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other countries in the face of various violations of the right to self-determination, including the colonial occupation of Namibia, Israeli aggression against the Arab countries and peoples, and United States aggression against Grenada, spoke louder than words about their true position on respect for the right to self-determination. The United Kingdom representative's appeal for vigilance would appear laudable if it had been sincere, but his delegation had serious doubts on that score in the light of the United Kingdom representative's full statement. That representative had made no reference to the flagrant violations of human rights to which he himself had just drawn attention. The absence of any reference to Grenada was particularly striking, in that Grenada was a member of the Commonwealth. The aggressive policies of the United States, which had recently been strengthened, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean, were a flagrant violation of the inalienable rights of many peoples and a threat to world peace and security.

50. Washington endeavoured to dictate the economic and political structure of sovereign States and the domestic and foreign policies they should follow. Nicaragua was the main target of its aggression in Central America, largely because the Nicaraguan people had refused to subordinate themselves to its dictates and to carry out its policies. In response to democratic reforms in that country, the people had overthrown the pro-United States Somoza regime. An undeclared war had then been waged against Nicaragua in an endeavour to subject its people to United States diktat. Thousands of mercenaries trained in United States bases and equipped with United States weapons had been sent into Nicaragua to attack ports, oil installations and other targets with the aim of paralysing the country and disrupting the peaceful life of its citizens. International credits had been blocked and a campaign of slander against the Sandinista Government had been instituted. The President of the United States had said that he believed in a country's right to engage in secret operations if it considered that they served its interests. That attitude showed no respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, but was rather an attempt to restore the law of the jungle.

51. United States aggression also took the form of subversive activities against Cuba. Continuous attempts to undermine the socialist type of development chosen by the Cuban people ranged from armed aggression to economic blockade, and from psychological warfare to direct threats. The occupation of part of Cuban territory persisted against the will of the Cuban people.

52. The interventionist policies of the United States and its threats against Nicaraguan security and the security of Central America as a whole had given rise to serious alarm throughout the world and had repeatedly been condemned by the non-aligned States. In a statement on 25 October 1983, the Soviet Government had pointed out that Washington's hegemonist policies and practices were a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of international law, the Charter and the provisions of the Final Act of Helsinki. In condemning United States aggression in Grenada and its interventionist policy in Nicaragua and other Central American countries, his country expressed its solidarity with the peoples of the area in their struggle for free development and self-determination. The Commission could not ignore the threat posed by United States military bases to the inalienable rights and vital interests of peoples throughout the world. The rapid-deployment forces for which the United States had established a central command were a sword of Damocles over the States of the Middle East, South-East Asia and Africa. The hegemonist imperialist policy pursued by that country, and the expansion of its nuclear-missile forces, threatened the existence of sovereign States and flagrantly violated the inalienable rights of peoples to decide their own destiny and economic and social structures without foreign interference.

53. The right of the Korean people to the reunification of their country on a peaceful and democratic basis and without outside interference was also impeded by the presence of United States troops. That dangerous policy of interference, and the pursuit of hegemonist and imperialist interests against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, represented open disregard of the right of the peoples concerned to self-determination and was detrimental to the efforts of the Afghan and Kampuchean peoples, who had embarked on social development and reconstruction. In sending to those countries bands of terrorists trained in subversion and equipped with the most modern weapons, the forces of imperialism, hegemony and reaction were endeavouring to divert the people from their chosen path. His delegation firmly rejected the insinuations made by imperialistic propaganda concerning the situation in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. It also rejected the attempts of certain countries to induce the Commission to consider that situation and to interfere in the internal affairs of those sovereign States. Any violation of the inalienable rights of the peoples of those countries, including their right to self-determination, was unlawful and incompatible with the Charter and the principles of international law. Those attempts were designed to exacerbate tension in south-west and south-east Asia and to impede the efforts of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the People's Republic of Kampuchea to reach a political settlement conducive to world peace and security.

54. The Soviet delegation would recognize only those representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Imperialist attempts to deny the rights of peoples were doomed to failure; social progress could not be halted.

55. One of the corner-stones of Soviet policy was solidarity with peoples shedding colonialist ties and seeking independent development, especially those who repelled the endeavours of imperialist forces to create hotbeds of tension and military conflict, against the interests of peace. The Soviet Government would follow its noble policy unswervingly.

56. Mr. DOWEK (Observer for Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to clarify a number of principles and positions which had been wrongly attributed to his country by delegations, such as those of the Soviet Union, Syria and the terrorist organizations, which wished to perpetuate war in the Middle East.

57. Mr. BARAKAT (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that Members of the United Nations had official names, which delegations should observe.

58. The CHAIRMAN requested members to refer to Member States and delegations by their official names or by descriptions which did not violate the Commission's decorum.

59. Mr. DOWEK (Observer for Israel) said that the delegations he had mentioned pursued their policies regardless of the enormous suffering inflicted on the peoples of the region, including the Palestinian Arabs. They had no interest in creating peaceful conditions that would allow the Palestinian Arab people to attain their rightful aspirations. The Palestinians were wantonly led astray by propagandistic resolutions which, as those responsible well knew, would remain dead letters. Syria had gone still further and used ruthless force against the Palestinians, massacring thousands whenever it seemed that they were attempting to reach a modus vivendi with Jordan or were contesting Syrian control over them. The terrorist organization had been even more ruthless and had assassinated any Palestinian who spoke of peaceful coexistence. However, political debate had no place in the Commission, which was mandated only to deal with human rights. Some delegations, with the gloomiest record of human rights violations, misused the Commission to prevent it from dealing with genuine abuses.

60. The draft resolution on item 9 regarding the Palestinian Arabs was political in nature and did not deal with human rights issues. The basic contention of the resolution was that the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination should be exercised only in a predetermined manner by appointing a single representative whom they would not elect - the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization. What kind of self-determination was that, which implied the elimination of Jordan and Israel?

61. Israel did not negate the right of the Palestinian Arabs to participate in the determination of their own future, a position which had been reflected in the Camp David accords. Israel supported the right of the Palestinians to have free elections, under adequate supervision, with the aim of permitting them to be represented in future negotiations by whoever they chose. No one, not even the Commission, could impose the PLO, a federation of terrorist organizations, on the Palestinians as their sole representative. Israel would have nothing to do with such self-styled leaders, imposed by foreign interests and manipulated by certain Arab regimes, whose sole policy was indiscriminate terror.

62. Israel was committed to discussing with freely-elected representatives of the Palestinians and with Jordan and Egypt the best way of solving the fundamental problems of the Middle East: the recognition of Israel within secure boundaries and the manner in which the Palestinian Arabs were to attain their just aspirations. Israel was also committed to withdrawing its administration from Judaea, Samaria and Gaza as soon as a self-governing administrative council had been freely elected by the Palestinian inhabitants.

63. Yet those positive steps had been rejected by those delegations which considered war and terrorism the only means of solving international problems and whose egoistic interests were best served through conflict and hatred. Moreover, the Commission was being called upon to condone a resolution calling for the rejection of all partial agreements and the autonomy plan which would enable the Palestinian Arabs, for the first time in their history, to rule themselves. The Commission had even been called upon to condone a resolution denouncing the strategic co-operation accord between the United States and Israel and to endorse the so-called "Geneva declaration on Palestine".

64. The voice of Israel was too weak to change the course on which the Commission was set, under the prompting of countries that were engaged in a propaganda onslaught. A bombastic political resolution would be adopted once again, but Israel would not heed any resolution which sought to foster war and block the road to peaceful coexistence. Israel was not Lebanon, which was agonizing under the complacent eyes of the international community. Israel did not fear Syria, and did not accept Syrian, or Russian, dictates. Israel would defend its right to life with all its strength, while extending its hand in peace to any country or people, including the Palestinian people, ready to accept it and march together towards understanding and co-operation.

65. Mr. ROMERO (Observer for Honduras), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said it seemed that efforts were being made to undermine the status of the Commission on Human Rights by turning it into a platform from which to launch attacks and confuse international public opinion.

66. A certain country, owing to its Government's anti-democratic policies, was opposing genuine self-determination for its people. Foreign interests were vying for domination, trying to impose regimes which undermined democratic aspirations and traditions. Efforts were being made to convert the Commission into a sanctuary for those who had betrayed their peoples by removing democratic freedoms, such as the right to organize free trade unions or to manifest religious beliefs.

67. The suppression of a dynastic tyranny by a totalitarian, expansionist and aggressive regime did not solve anything. A solution could be found only by fighting for peace, which was the principal aim of the Contadora Group. Honduras was prepared, in the face of the disproportionate arms build-up by its neighbour, to defend all facets of its sovereignty and its democratic system of government.

68. Mr. SCHIFFER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in 1979 a pro-Moscow dictatorship had been established in Grenada. Anyone not in sympathy with the ruling group had been jailed for political offences. The new regime had neglected the island's fragile economy and had concentrated on building up its military forces, while many of its neighbours had no armed forces at all. Such developments had understandably been a source of concern to Grenada's peace-loving neighbours. In October 1983 the ruling group had split, one faction killing the members of the other. The victorious faction had established a curfew and other restrictive measures which had given rise to fears for the welfare of the residents of the island, including United States residents.

69. It was in that context that other eastern Caribbean nations, Jamaica and the United States had acted. The results had been independence and self-determination, and the protection of all the basic values contained in the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Polls had indicated that 91 per cent of the people of Grenada had approved of the intervention. That was a much larger percentage than the number of Cubans and Nicaraguans who approved of their respective Governments. The Commission should welcome the restoration of freedom and democracy in Grenada, as did the people of that island.

70. In Nicaragua a coalition had assumed power in 1979, promising a new era of freedom. The United States had expressed its goodwill towards the new Government and provided economic assistance. But it had subsequently become clear that non-Leninists were being squeezed out of positions of authority, in addition to which there had been a military build-up and meddling in the internal affairs of Nicaragua's neighbours, including assistance to insurgents trying to overthrow their respective Governments. At the same time the Managua Government had tightened its grip on the people of Nicaragua. Censorship had been established, political dissidents had been arrested and steps taken to drive a wedge between the people and the Catholic Church. The promise of free elections had been postponed again and again.

71. The United States hoped that Nicaragua would fulfil the promise made by the new regime in 1979 to establish a genuinely democratic government. Such a regime would no doubt end Nicaragua's support for insurgents and terrorism, would sever its military ties with the Soviet Union and would reduce the size of Nicaragua's military forces to a level that would restore a balance with its neighbours. The United States was hoping for a Nicaragua which would respect its neighbours' right to self-determination.

72. It was ironic that the Commission had been lectured on self-determination by the country which, in November 1917, had snuffed out the glimmers of self-determination in its own country, which had annexed the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which had repressed self-determination in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, which had forced the Polish Government to take repressive action against its own people and which was currently engaged in a colonial war in Afghanistan.

73. Mr. BUCKINGHAM (Canada) said that a country's constitution mirrored its society. The Canadian Constitution Act of 1982 reflected a democratic, future-oriented country that was intent on promoting social justice. The Canadian Constitution provided that every individual should be considered equal under Canadian law and entitled to protection against discrimination on any grounds. The aboriginal and treaty rights of the native peoples of Canada had been recognized and affirmed by the Act. The equal rights provisions of the Act would come into force in 1985, the three-year delay being necessary to allow federal, provincial and territorial governments to amend existing laws which did not conform to the new Act.

74. Mr. HILALY (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that a number of baseless allegations had been made against his country. Pakistan's position on Afghanistan was in accordance with the principles of the international community. His Government had always maintained a policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, despite the fact that Pakistan had been seriously affected by the crisis in that country. Pakistan had provided food and shelter to some 3 million Afghans who had fled their country following the military intervention in 1979. Those people were housed in refugee camps open to inspection by any international body, including ICRC and UNHCR, which had attested to the status of the refugees. Any attempts to misconstrue the situation amounted to regrettable disregard of the suffering of the Afghan people. The situation in Afghanistan could not be masked by making accusations against Pakistan, the causes of the exodus could not be lightly dismissed, and the resistance to foreign intervention could not be glossed over. In fact, popular resistance was widespread throughout Afghanistan, including the north. It was to be hoped that a political solution could be found to a situation in which his Government had acted with restraint. Allegations against Pakistan would do nothing to promote a political settlement.

75. With regard to the situation in Kashmir and Jammu, his delegation did not wish to engage in a debate with the representative of India. The position of his Government was well known.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.