

elsewhere, since their presence was a source of national and international tension.

54. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that it was not clear from the remarks made by the representative of Israel whether the Jews were expelled from the Syrian Arab Republic after their possessions had been confiscated or whether they escaped secretly at serious risk to their lives. What was abundantly clear was the fate incurred by the people of Palestine who, as the whole world knew, had been driven *en masse* from their lands by the Zionist invaders.

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Finland, Swaziland and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2151; the delegations of Mali and the Sudan had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2152; the delegation of Guinea had joined the sponsors of the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.2155 and A/C.3/L.2156; and the delegations of Afghanistan, Guinea and the Sudan had become sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.2157.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

## 2121st meeting

Friday, 3 October 1975, at 3 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2121

### AGENDA ITEM 68

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*)

(a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/10003, chap. I, chap. V; sect. B.1, paras. 307-313; A/10145 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5636 and Add.1-3, E/5637 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2152, 2154-2157);

(c) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/10197, A/C.3/L.2151, 2153)

#### GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*) and CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

1. Mrs. ZONDO (Swaziland) said that Swaziland was opposed to racial discrimination in all its forms and believed that meaningful progress in achieving international co-operation and understanding could never be made as long as racial discrimination continued to endanger international social harmony. The Government and people of Swaziland were determined to eradicate the evil of racial discrimination in all spheres of life—economic, social and political.

2. On the national level, a council committee, appointed in 1969 as a "watchdog" against racial discrimination, met regularly to investigate any manifestation of that evil. Swaziland had successfully eliminated the colonial system of education under which schools had been divided into European, Eurafrikan and African groups, and determined efforts were being made to streamline the educational system to suit the needs and aspirations of the country. Training and localization provided equal employment opportunities for all in the public and private sectors of the economy, and 97 per cent of all jobs in the public service were held by Swazi citizens. It was government policy to help create opportunities for Swazi citizens of all races to participate fully in every sector of the economy of

Swaziland. Recently two farmers' organizations, one representing indigenous Swazi farmers and the other expatriate white farmers, had decided to join together, with the Government's encouragement, to form one Swaziland Farmers' Association which would promote the interests of all farmers in the country.

3. Swaziland's policy of non-racialism seemed to be acting as a catalyst in the region, and in the view of her Government, Swaziland's good example of race relations had helped to weaken the abhorrent system of *apartheid* in South Africa. Swaziland had acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex) in April 1969.

4. In view of the importance of further strengthening the fight against racism and racial discrimination, her delegation supported the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII) (A/10145, annex, draft resolution A). Her Government also supported the draft resolution recommended by the Council in its resolution 1938 B (LVIII) with regard to the holding of a world conference to combat racism and racial discrimination during the Decade (*ibid.*, draft resolution B), and welcomed the generous offer of the Government of Ghana to host the conference.

5. Mr. GOLOVKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/L.2152 and recalled that Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates had become sponsors. He quoted from the statement made by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* at the General Assembly's 2201st meeting in plenary on 14 December 1973, stressing the importance of ratifying the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. The operative part of the draft resolution contained specific proposals which had already been confirmed in similar form at previous sessions of the General Assembly, so that the draft resolution should find broad support among delegations.

6. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay), introducing the amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2151 contained in document A/C.3/L.2153, recalled that her Government had been the first to make the declaration provided for in article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Subsequently Costa Rica, the Netherlands and Sweden had made such a declaration. That declaration was optional and could be withdrawn; furthermore, article 14 specified very clearly that the Committee could receive and consider communications only from States parties which declared that they recognized its competence in that respect. The drafting of the optional article had given rise to lengthy negotiations in the Committee in 1965 in order to accommodate the different positions on it, and although some delegations had had reservations, the article had been approved without any negative vote.

7. Her delegation was presenting the amendment in a constructive spirit for three reasons: it would be a contribution to the work of the Committee in connexion with the Decade, it would constitute a further endorsement of the Convention, and it was a way of reiterating support for the work of the Committee. The amendment had been drafted in such a way as to be acceptable to most delegations; it did not request States parties to make the declaration but appealed to them to study the possibility of doing so. The principle of considering communications of that nature was not new in the United Nations, since it was a practice in the Commission on Human Rights and in those bodies responsible for the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In the opinion of her delegation, support for that amendment would not in any way prejudice the final attitude which Governments might adopt on the advisability of making such a declaration.

8. Ms. FINBORUD (Norway) said that her delegation supported the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2153. She further announced that Norway had recognized the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Norway, claiming to be victims of a violation by Norway of any of the rights set forth in the International Convention, in accordance with article 14 of that Convention, with the reservation that the Committee should not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee had ascertained that the same matter was not being examined and had not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

9. Miss BIHI (Somalia), introducing the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2157, recalled that Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, and the United Arab Emirates had become sponsors of the amendment.

10. The peoples of Africa had been subjected to the terror of *apartheid* and of similar practices perpetrated by the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, which thrived on the exploitation and brutal suppression of the indigenous population by the white minority. The General Assembly had unequivocally condemned such practices and had also condemned the unholy alliance with the Zionist régime in

the Middle East. That régime had shown beyond doubt that it used the same methods against the indigenous population as the racist régimes of southern Africa, since it had uprooted the Palestinians from their homeland and deprived them of the free exercise of the right to self-determination. That had been confirmed in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX). The Zionist régime had been condemned on several occasions by the United Nations for the practice of racial discrimination against the population and its traditions, culture and religion. Zionism, through the practices of the Zionist military authorities in Palestine, showed beyond doubt the abominable nature of racial discrimination.

11. It was in that light that the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held in Mexico from 19 June to 2 July 1975, had adopted a declaration pointing to the need for the elimination of *zionism* and *apartheid* for the sake of international co-operation and peace. (see E/5725, chap. I). The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, had condemned *zionism* as a threat to world peace and security in paragraph 58 of its Political Declaration.<sup>1</sup> In paragraph 8 of resolution VIII,<sup>2</sup> the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries had decided to organize an information campaign to unmask the racist and aggressive nature of the Zionist entity.

12. Mr. WILSON (Liberia), speaking on a point of order, suggested that the vote on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157 with regard to draft resolution A (see A/10145, annex), should be postponed until the next meeting.

13. Ms. MUTUKWA (Zambia) and Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana) supported that suggestion.

14. Mrs. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) also supported the suggestion, and further proposed an oral amendment to draft resolution A, which would consist of adding at the end of operative paragraph 5(b) the words "in particular, an international competition should be organized to select an appropriate emblem for the Decade, and posters displaying the emblem should be printed for wide distribution."

15. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone the vote on the amendments to draft resolution A.

*It was so decided.*

16. Mr. HERZOG (Israel) said that the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157, under cover of an attack on *zionism*, constituted not only an anti-Semitic attack of the most offensive type but also an attack on Judaism, one of the oldest religions in the world, which had given the world the human values of the Bible and from which two other great religions, Christianity and Islam, had sprung. One could but wonder at the spectacle of countries which considered themselves to be part of the civilized world joining in the first organized attack on an established religion since the Middle Ages. The resolution before the

<sup>1</sup> See A/10217 and Corr.1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Committee could achieve a consensus which was of great importance to the African countries in particular and to the world in general. However, a group of countries, drunk with the feeling of power resulting from the majority vote automatically at their disposal and without regard to the importance of achieving a consensus, had decided to "railroad" the Committee in a contemptible manoeuvre into bracketing zionism with the subject under discussion.

17. Zionism was the name of the national movement of the Jewish people and was the modern expression of the ancient Jewish heritage. The Zionist ideal, as set out in the Bible, had been and was an integral part of the Jewish religion, based on the unique and unbroken connexion, extending for some 4,000 years, between the People of the Book and the Land of the Bible. In modern times, spurred by the twin forces of anti-Semitic persecution and nationalism, the Jewish people had organized the Zionist movement in order to transform its dream into reality. Support for its aim had been written into the League of Nations mandate over Palestine and had again been endorsed by the United Nations in 1947, when the General Assembly had voted by an overwhelming majority to restore the independence of the Jewish people in its ancient land. He recalled that the Soviet Union had strongly supported that proposal. It was sad to see a group of nations, many of whom had recently freed themselves from colonial rule, being swept along by the automatic majority which evinced little concern for their national interests, deriding one of the most noble liberation movements of the century and associating it with abhorrent political concepts. That movement had not only given an example of encouragement and determination to the peoples struggling for independence but had also actively aided many of them during the period of preparation for their independence or immediately thereafter.

18. Israel had endeavoured to create a society which strove to implement the highest political, social and cultural ideals for all the inhabitants of Israel, irrespective of religious belief, race or sex. It was difficult to cite another pluralistic society in the world where two nations lived together in such harmony as in Israel and where the dignity and rights of man were observed before the law.

19. The Arab representatives talked of racism. What had happened to the 800,000 Jews who had lived for over 2,000 years in the Arab lands and who had constituted some of the most ancient communities long before the advent of Islam? He could point with pride to Arab ministers who had served in his Government, Arab officers and men serving of their own volition in the Israeli armed forces and police forces, hundreds of thousands of Arab tourists visiting Israel every year and thousands of Arabs from all over the Middle East arriving for medical treatment at Jerusalem and elsewhere. Zionism, of course, encountered problems in its attempt to build a society in which the vision of the prophets of Israel would be realized, and people in Israel were free to disagree with the Government's policies, because zionism had created the first and only genuinely democratic State in a part of the world that had never really seen democracy and freedom of speech. He was aware that it was necessary to advance towards peace by seeking compromise, but malicious amendments of the kind proposed scarcely provided a way to do that. They were part of a dangerous anti-Semitic idiom which was being

insinuated into every public debate by those who had sworn to block the current move towards accommodation and ultimately towards peace in the Middle East and to sabotage the efforts of the Geneva Conference for peace in the Middle East. The saboteurs would not succeed, and he could only reaffirm his Government's policy of making every move in the direction of peace based on compromise.

20. He called on the Committee to reject the amendments out of hand in the interests of humanity and in the interests of progress towards peace in the Middle East. He would ask for a roll-call vote on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157, not merely for procedural reasons but in order that the stand of each country on the issue of anti-Semitism might be recorded for history.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the representative of Israel had been brainwashed by the leaders of zionism and believed their assertions to be true. The remarks of the representative of Israel were the result of his indoctrination. The Arab world had no quarrel with Judaism. On the contrary, the Arab world regarded Judaism as another religion and highly appreciated the wisdom contained in the Old Testament. He stressed that the quarrel of the Arab world was with zionism, a political movement which had originated in Europe and not in the Orient, where the Jews had never been discriminated against and where many persons in the Arab culture happened to be Jews.

22. The representative of Israel had claimed that the Arabs were anti-Semites. However, that would mean that they were against their own culture and way of life. The fact was that they were called anti-Semites because they were against a political movement.

23. Palestine had been inhabited by a peaceful people. Many had been Jews who had been converted to Christianity and subsequently to Islam. The Jews from Eastern and Central Europe had brought turmoil and bloodshed to Palestine, not peace. The nationality laws of Israel were self-defeating and contradictory. It was self-defeating in that many Jews in the world did not wish to be identified with the Zionist movement. It was contradictory in that the Zionists wished to regard every Jew as belonging to an exclusive religion. That exclusivity was tantamount to an artificial racialism. He called on the Jews to ennoble Judaism and to renounce geographic zionism, which was a political movement. He urged them to stop their propaganda before it was too late because they might once again become the scapegoat of people who would persecute them.

24. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that he wished to put forward the position of the nine members of the European Economic Community on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157. He stressed that all the members of the community condemned racism and racial discrimination. However, they did not believe that it was appropriate or relevant for the proposed amendments to identify zionism as a form of racial discrimination. In their view, to do so would be to work against the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Furthermore, it would hamper the efforts being made to find a solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

The proposed amendments would be incompatible with the position of the respective Governments of the Communities, which would therefore be opposed to them. If the amendments were adopted, the members of the Community would be unable to accept the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII), and it would become difficult to achieve a consensus. He therefore called on the sponsors not to press their amendments; the nine members of the Community would then be able to vote in favour of the original draft resolution recommended by the Council.

25. Mrs. MARICO (Mali), introducing on behalf of the sponsors those amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154 concerning the draft resolution recommended by the Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII), said that the migration of workers was a system by which workers went from their own countries to others in order to find work. The phenomenon of migrant workers had become part of the social, economic and political system of the modern world and had thus made it possible to achieve two goals by satisfying the labour needs of the more developed countries and supplying work to persons from less developed countries. If such persons were to be as productive as expected, however, it was necessary to provide them with decent living conditions and to extend to them treatment equal to that provided for nationals of the host country. Unfortunately, such conditions did not obtain, and migrant workers were often subjected to racism, racial discrimination and exploitation.

26. At its preceding session, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3224 (XXIX), which provided for measures to improve the situation of migrant workers. In order to be logical, the Committee should, in dealing with the question of the elimination of racism and racial discrimination, again adopt a resolution relating to migrant workers. Her delegation was therefore proposing two amendments to draft resolution A. The first amendment was intended to add a new second preambular paragraph recalling General Assembly resolutions 2920 (XXVII) and 3224 (XXIX). The second amendment was intended to add a new paragraph 3 (*i*) to ensure "the cessation of all discriminatory measures against migrant workers" and extend to them "treatment equal to that provided for nationals of the host country". The amendments were being submitted because the struggle of migrant workers should be mentioned in the discussion of racial discrimination and would contribute to ensuring social justice.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that Lesotho had become a sponsor of the amendments contained in documents A/C.3/L.2154 and A/C.3/L.2156.

28. Mr. GARMENT (United States of America) said that his Government supported draft resolution A on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. His Government had worked with the firmest resolve, and with considerable success, to eliminate the evils of racial discrimination, and he believed that that experience and commitment put his country in a unique position to further the work of the Decade.

29. His delegation strongly opposed the amendments to that draft resolution, contained in document A/C.3/

L.2157. The content of the amendments was not only unjust but ominous, because it treated the word racism as if it were merely an epithet to be flung at whoever happened to be one's adversary. It turned an idea with vivid and obnoxious meaning into an ideological tool and deprived the members of the Committee of the ability to see reality together and deal with it together. That could be nothing short of a tragedy for an Organization so dedicated to, and so dependent upon, the possibilities of reason and persuasion. Amendments of that kind could only exacerbate group hostility and increase the tensions and passions which had for so long prevented the achievement of peace in so many troubled areas of the world. They were, in his delegation's view, entirely incompatible with the purposes of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. To equate zionism with racism was to distort completely the history of the Zionist movement, born of the centuries of oppression suffered by the Jewish people in the western world and designed to liberate an oppressed people by returning them to the land of their fathers. It was no service to the great goals of the United Nations to ignore and to distort history in that fashion. The tragedy in the Middle East stemmed from the failure so far to find a way of protecting and accommodating the rights of each group living there, those of the Jews and those of the Arabs, both with a long and proud history in the region. His delegation would therefore oppose the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157, and would oppose the entire draft resolution if any of those amendments were adopted.

30. He further wished to state that the tendency to jeopardize the adoption of draft resolutions of primary importance which enjoyed the strong support of all delegations by submitting amendments that would only sow discord in the Committee was destructive of its capacity to further the objectives of the Organization and to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. The agenda of the Committee was filled with history and passion, and it was all too easy to use words which distort and divide. It was the responsibility of the Committee to use language enlightened by history and to use it precisely and carefully, mindful of the differences between members but determined to overcome rather than enlarge them.

31. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq) said that his delegation reserved the right to reply at a future meeting to the statements made by the representatives of Israel and the United States of America.

32. Mr. SANCHEZ (Venezuela) said that there were legal norms inherent in the sovereignty of States which could not be ignored in dealing with a matter which might imply the non-application of legislation and official policies governing the admission of aliens. He was aware that the second amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.2154 was prompted by humanitarian considerations, but it gave rise to an undesirable confrontation between the application of measures to benefit migrant workers and the standards underlying the social order of a State, standards established to ensure justice and maintain public order. The problem was not unilateral in nature and concerned at least two States: the country of origin and the host country. It was therefore a problem which must take account of the sovereign rights of all the parties concerned. The matter

also involved questions of education, health and housing which became more serious where such migration was uncontrolled.

33. It was not possible to ensure equal social and economic conditions in all countries, either in the countries of origin or in the host countries. In some cases migration served to complement local manpower, while in others, it gave rise to competition and created undesirable labour conflicts.

34. It would not be correct to regard as discriminatory any measure which a State took in full exercise of its sovereignty and which supplemented legislation affecting all persons residing in its territory, including migrant workers. If a State exempted migrant workers from such legislation, that would imply the renunciation by that State of the full exercise of its sovereignty within its frontiers. Such situations must be resolved through the application of domestic legislation, and migration should be controlled by means of negotiations between the parties concerned, with understanding, respect and justice. While recognizing the humanitarian considerations underlying the amendment, his delegation was unable to accept it in its present wording. His delegation was in favour of the defence of human rights without any restrictions whatever, and of the right of workers to the full enjoyment of the social product, whatever their nationality might be, but such enjoyment should take place within the standards set forth in the country concerned. It must also be borne in mind that to speak of treatment identical to that provided for nationals without specifying the matter concerned was to make a generalization which implied a violation of the constitutional provisions of the host country. The constitutions of countries made distinctions, which were not discriminatory in nature, between the exercise of specific rights and the obligation of nationals and aliens to perform certain duties. The general statement that treatment equal to that provided for nationals must be extended to migrant workers was not acceptable to his delegation. He stressed that the population of his country consisted of people of many races who had come there at different periods of Venezuelan history. His country was proud of its traditions and of the fact that its social democracy was based on a spirit of equality between all its inhabitants. His country's nationals enjoyed full equality under the law, and the same applied to aliens legally resident in the national territory.

35. If the text of operative paragraph 3 (*i*) indicated that migrant workers entered the territory of a State with its express consent, his delegation would vote in favour of the amendment. Otherwise, it would be obliged to vote against it.

36. Miss BIHI (Somalia) said that the representative of Saudi Arabia had answered exhaustively the distorted allegations made by the representative of Israel.

37. Somalia was proud of its record in the field of human rights. As the representative of Israel had stated, her country and others were involved in a moral war with the Zionist régime in the Middle East and opposed that régime because Zionism, like *apartheid*, was used as an instrument for perpetuating oppression and discrimination against one group of people by another, by depriving the Palestinians of

their homeland and of their property for believing and professing another religion and for being Arabs. If the Zionists were really interested in peace and a peace settlement in the region, they should recognize the just rights of the Palestinian people to their homeland. The Zionist régime would be ostracized and shunned not only by the United Nations, which, through numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, had shown its overwhelming opposition to the existence of Israel as currently constituted, but also by all peace-loving people all over the world.

38. Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154, said that his delegation had no difficulty with the wording of the first amendment or with the idea behind the second amendment. It was, however, of the opinion that the words "equal treatment" in the second amendment were not very specific. In that connexion, he recalled that his delegation had had a similar problem with General Assembly resolution 3224 (XXIX), and he drew the attention of the sponsors of the amendments in question to paragraph 4 (*a*) of that resolution. He suggested that they might agree to add, at the end of proposed paragraph 3 (*i*), the wording which had been adopted in paragraph 4 (*a*) of that resolution, namely, "with regard to human rights and to the provisions of their labour legislation applicable to such migrant workers". That suggestion would enable his delegation to support the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154.

39. Mrs. MARICO (Mali), referring to the statement made by the representative of Venezuela concerning the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154, said that her delegation and the other sponsors of those amendments had a different point of view with regard to the problem of migrant workers. Moreover, she pointed out that the amendments did not relate to migrant workers who had entered a country clandestinely and were not intended to deal with persons who took illegal refuge in foreign countries; rather, they were intended to apply to workers who sought employment legally in accordance with the laws of the host country.

40. With regard to the suggestion made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, she said that her delegation would have no problem in accepting it but would have to consult with the other sponsors before giving a definite reply.

41. Mr. DABO (Guinea), referring to the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157, said that his country, which was opposed to any attitude of racial discrimination, did not consider them to be an expression of hostility towards Israel, with which his country had established friendly relations when it had gained its independence. At present, however, it believed that Palestine should become a democratic State belonging to all those who inhabited it, i.e. both to the Arabs and to the Jews, and that the Palestinian people should be allowed to return to their homeland.

42. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully supported the goals and objectives of the Programme for the Decade and believed

6552  
 that at the current session it would be possible to ensure the implementation of the Programme, which did not deal exhaustively with the subject and should therefore be supplemented by concrete proposals. Such proposals were to be found in the draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/10145, annex). He noted that some delegations were of the opinion that those draft resolutions should not be amended, but his delegation considered that approach to be erroneous because draft resolutions could always be improved and supplemented, as had been shown in the discussions in the Committee. His delegation therefore supported draft resolutions A and B recommended by the Economic and Social Council and those amendments submitted to the Committee which aimed at achieving the goals and purposes of the Decade.

43. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolutions and amendments now before the Committee, particularly those contained in document A/C.3/L.2157. He noted that those amendments made no reference to suffering or to the right of all peoples to self-determination, but simply to a political phenomenon based on exclusivity, racism and racial discrimination. In that connexion, he said that, under the Israeli "law of return", any Jew who went to Israel could obtain Israeli citizenship, but that right was denied to the Palestinian Arabs. That was a clear example of exclusivity and racial discrimination.

44. Paragraph 13 (f) of the Programme for the Decade, which condemned activities aimed at encouraging settler-colonialism, could be used as a criterion to determine that Israel's policy of not allowing the Palestinians to return to their homeland was racist in nature. Another criterion was to be found in the definition of "racial discrimination" contained in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It had been on the basis of those criteria that the World Conference of the International Women's Year held in Mexico City and the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held in Lima in 1975 had taken the stand of linking zionism to racist policies and condemning it along with *apartheid*.

45. Finally, he noted that certain delegations had stated that they could not support the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2157 because the adoption of those amendments would prevent them from supporting the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council. That was a rather weak pretext, however, since those delegations could always reserve their position on the question of zionism in relation to racism and racial discrimination and still support the draft resolution in question.

46. Mrs. TAIROVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that it was quite natural for the majority of delegations to favour the earliest possible elimination of racism and racial discrimination, since those evils had been condemned as violations of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The delegation of Israel had, however, used the discussion of the question of the elimination of racism and racial discrimination for goals and purposes which had absolutely no relation to the matters under consideration.

47. Her delegation categorically rejected any allegations that Jews were being persecuted in the Soviet Union, as had been stated in Zionist propaganda. In her country, all citizens had full rights and were always treated on a basis of equality. Israel should recognize that no slander would ever change that truth and should refrain from accusing the Soviet Union of persecuting such people as Sylva Zalmanson and her husband, who were criminals accused of hijacking an airliner. The crime they had committed was punishable by law and should not be praised.

48. The question also arose whether Israel was continuing to make slanderous allegations against the Soviet Union in order to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the fact that racism and racial discrimination were State policies in Israel, as well as in South Africa. Israel used propaganda merely to hide its expansionist intentions and its support of the racist régimes in southern Africa. Israel's racism and racial discrimination against the Arabs and other groups were a clear example of a policy of racism, and it was therefore not surprising that so many people were fleeing Israel. In that connexion, she recalled that during the closing stage of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—the Final Act of which had been signed at Helsinki in August 1975—her delegation had stressed the important results achieved at that Conference and had asked what moral right Israel had to pose as the defender of human rights and fundamental freedoms in view of the fact that it had not ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination or the International Covenants on Human Rights adopted by the United Nations.

#### AGENDA ITEM 84

**Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General (A/10196)**

#### *Entry into force of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*

49. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), referring to the ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) by the Government of Jamaica, read out the following statement by the Secretary-General:

"On the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations, it is indeed gratifying for me to announce that the thirty-fifth instrument accepting the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been deposited today by the Government of Jamaica. Thus, it will be possible for this most important instrument in the field of human rights to come into force in three months' time in accordance with its provisions.

"Today we have moved one step closer to achieving the historic undertaking that was initiated by the United Nations from the very beginning of its existence—to complement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with a legally binding international treaty. The Inter-

national Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights, as well as the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which include measures enabling the international community to monitor their application by the States Parties, were adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 and opened for signature, ratification or accession.

"In addition to its ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of Jamaica has also ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol. There is justified expectation that the one more instrument needed for the coming into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights will be forthcoming in the near future along with the Optional Protocol which has already received more than 10 ratifications or accessions needed for its coming into force.

"The historic international instruments will furnish the United Nations and its members important tools for the achievement of one of the main objectives of the Charter of the world Organization—the promotion of human

rights for all, without discrimination as to race, sex, language or religion. I hope that many other States will join the ranks of those which, by ratifying or acceding to the Covenants, have solemnly expressed their willingness to contribute to the realization of this noble goal."

50. He said he thought that the Committee, which played such an important role in preparing the International Covenants, would find great satisfaction in that important announcement by the Secretary-General. He also hoped that the Committee would join him in expressing appreciation to the Government of Jamaica, whose representatives had played such an important role in the adoption of the Covenants.

51. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) said that her Government was pleased that it had been able to ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and thus make it possible for that instrument to enter into force. Her delegation was grateful to the Director of the Division of Human Rights for his kind words regarding her country's ratification.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*

## 2122nd meeting

Monday, 6 October 1975, at 3 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2122

### AGENDA ITEM 68

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*):

- (a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/10003, chap. I, chap. V, sect. B. 1., paras. 307-313; A/10145 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5636 and Add.1-3, E/5637 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2152, 2154-2157);
- (c) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/10197, A/C.3/L.2151, 2153)

### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

1. Miss BIHI (Somalia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2157, of which Somalia was one, said that, after consultation with some of the delegations, it had been decided, in order to maintain the spirit of constructive co-operation which characterized the Committee's work, to ask the Chairman and the members of the Committee to agree to postpone the vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII) (A/10145, annex, draft resolution A). The delegations concerned hoped that if a little more time was allowed it might be

possible to reach a decision by consensus. Therefore, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, she asked that debate on the item under discussion should be adjourned.

2. Mrs. BURNLEY (United Republic of Cameroon) supported the proposal of the representative of Somalia, agreeing that it was desirable to reach a consensus.

3. Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana) felt that the proposal of the representative of Somalia was very constructive. The Committee was keenly interested in the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and he felt that it was very important that a very broad consensus should be formed with regard to the implementation of the Programme for the Decade (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex). He therefore supported the Somali representative's proposal; furthermore, in view of his country's great interest in the draft resolution recommended in Council resolution 1938 B (LVIII) (A/10145, annex, draft resolution B), he hoped that the vote on that draft would also be postponed.

4. Miss BIHI (Somalia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments, said that she had no objection to that suggestion and therefore agreed that the vote on the draft resolutions under consideration should be postponed.