

item (a) of agenda item 68 and that it had subsequently been decided that the amendments should be submitted in the form of a draft resolution. She therefore failed to see why the representative of Sierra Leone did not recognize that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was connected with subitem (a) of agenda item 68.

24. Mr. KAMARAKE (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation was satisfied with the clarification given by the representative of Somalia and withdrew its motion for adjournment.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

2134th meeting

Friday, 17 October 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2134

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.3/638, A/C.3/L.2154 -2156, 2159)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*)

1. Mr. KAMARAKE (Sierra Leone), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation wished the suggestion which it had made at the preceding meeting, concerning possible postponement of the consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, to be considered as a formal proposal worded as follows:

“Considering that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.2159 has been declared as having been submitted in connexion with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,

“Conscious of the adverse consequences the adoption of this draft resolution as worded would have on the success of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination,

“Recalling that resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU had no relation with the Decade as proclaimed by the United Nations,

“Recalling also that the Political Declaration adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held in Lima was not adopted in relation to the Decade,

“Aware of the fact that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 would introduce a materially new element which was not contemplated and therefore was not discussed at the time when the decision to proclaim the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was reached by the United Nations General Assembly, and therefore would require further study,

“ Requests the Committee to consider the postponement of consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.”

2. That proposal was motivated, in particular, by the provisions of the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, where reference was made to OAU resolution 77 (XII). It would appear very difficult at that stage to include draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 in the discussion on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, welcomed the fact that the representative of Sierra Leone had crystallized in the proposal he had just made a feeling which had inevitably emerged. It would thus be possible to clarify positions. Even if some members of the Committee did not fully share the views of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, there was no need for them to make special efforts to formulate a proposal specifically designed to postpone consideration of that draft. There was nothing to prevent a vote being taken on the draft resolution, at which time delegations which had not received instructions on the subject would be free to abstain. Nor did he see why a relation had to be established between what had been done by the OAU and the question of Zionism. He personally agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration that Zionism was the expression of a racist philosophy. It was true that any members of the Committee who so desired were entitled to request that consideration of the draft resolution be postponed. Nevertheless, he appealed to the Sierra Leonean representative to withdraw his proposal in a brotherly spirit. The question dealt with in the draft resolution existed in the Middle East; it did not exist in Sierra Leone, any more than it existed in a Latin American country or in any other continent. It was time to stop delaying tactics. He was extremely sorry for the Jews, whom he considered as friends, because Zionism was doing them a great deal of harm. Yet there were many minorities in the world whose existence posed no problem.

4. He also pointed out that he had already had considerable experience of the United Nations long before the representative of Sierra Leone had joined the ranks of the Members of the Organization. That was why he ventured to remind that representative that it was solely considerations

of a political nature which had led the United Kingdom to make the Balfour Declaration, in order to please the United States, whose support it had needed in order to win the war against Germany.

5. The British and the Americans might well invoke democracy, when in 1914 the large Jewish population of Palestine had still been living in peace with the Arabs. What would become of the memory of the British Empire and what would become of the American myth, if the United Kingdom and the United States persisted thus in supporting a bad cause? He issued a warning to the members of the Committee, particularly to the representative of Sierra Leone and the representative of Barbados, since the position which they had adopted could not serve the cause of peace but might, on the contrary, cause a growing commotion and exacerbate intolerance, raising to a climax the exasperation of the forces involved and increasing the risk of a third world war. The Jews must try to become accepted in the Middle East and to escape from the psychosis in which Zionism had imprisoned them. He himself had been born and had grown up in the Middle East and had then lived in France and in the United Kingdom before living in the United States; he had thus been able to see the Zionists at work in many places. Their influence was so great that in the United States Congress they could count on the support of 76 senators. In the United Kingdom, France and many other countries, they manipulated information media and preyed upon gullible public opinion with their propaganda.

6. His delegation therefore specifically requested that the draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.2159 be put to the vote immediately.

7. Mrs. MUTUKWA (Zambia) said that it was the view of her delegation that consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 should be postponed to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. Members of the Committee should not regard that decision as an affirmation of support for Zionism; her delegation simply believed that questions of such great importance deserved separate consideration. At that stage, it would be quite wrong to link draft resolutions concerning the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to the draft resolution concerning Zionism. She stressed the importance of each of those questions and pointed out that the Committee had had ample time to consider the former question and that it would not be logical to reach a hasty decision on the latter.

8. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates), speaking on a point of order, said that he wished to clarify a procedural matter. The representative of Sierra Leone, supported by the representative of Zambia, had requested that the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 be postponed to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. Neither representative had explained which rule of procedure they had been invoking. He personally could see only two possibilities: rules 116 or 119 could be applied and the debate on the item under consideration (Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination) would be adjourned; alternatively, rule 131 could be applied and in that case the Committee should not postpone the vote but should vote on the proposals in the order in which they had been submitted. He therefore proposed that the Committee

should vote on the proposal in document A/C.3/L.2159 and on the proposal just made by the Sierra Leonean representative and that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, it should start by voting on the former proposal.

9. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation was slightly perplexed by the two somewhat different proposals made at the preceding meeting and at the current meeting by the representative of Sierra Leone. What exactly did that representative have in mind? Had he wished to raise a point of order requesting postponement of the debate on both subitems (a) and (c) of agenda item 68, or had he been making a new proposal? In the former case, there was no room for doubt and rule 116 was clear: a vote should be taken immediately to decide whether to postpone to the thirty-first session the debate on the issues raised in those subitems. If, on the other hand, the Sierra Leonean representative wished to submit a new proposal, the situation was more complicated. It would be recalled that the same problem had arisen at the 2130th meeting and that on that occasion the Committee had decided that a new proposal was acceptable. If a new proposal was being made, the Committee would therefore have to consider first whether it was admissible; if it decided in the affirmative, a new problem would arise, as had been pointed out by the representative of the United Arab Emirates, and rule 131 would have to be applied, since draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 had priority. His delegation reserved the right to speak again when the Sierra Leonean representative had clarified his intentions.

10. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) supported the representative of Sierra Leone and the representative of Zambia. The proposal made by the representative of Sierra Leone was quite clear and he did not understand the hesitation of the representatives of the United Arab Emirates and Cuba. The representatives of Sierra Leone and Zambia had spoken as Africans on behalf of the African continent, and the Barbadian delegation supported them whole-heartedly. What was the meaning of the Sierra Leonean representative's proposal? The Committee was considering the question of the Decade; when the time came to put to the vote draft resolutions A and B concerning the Decade (A/10145, annex) recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolutions 1938 A and B (LVIII), Sierra Leone proposed that consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 concerning Zionism be postponed to the following session. The Barbadian delegation would not vote for that draft resolution, which fostered opposition between countries and impeded the struggle against racism.

11. Mr. KAMARAKE (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation was not trying to protect either Israel or Zionism, but that it needed more time to weigh all the implications of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. With regard to the various rules of procedure which had been mentioned, he recalled that at the 2130th meeting, in a similar situation, it had been said that the Committee was the master of its own procedure: it was therefore the Committee which should decide on the Sierra Leonean proposal.

12. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that he had specifically requested that the Sierra Leonean proposal be put to the vote. Nevertheless, in order to avoid another

procedural debate, he again appealed to the Sierra Leonean delegation to withdraw its proposal and recalled that closure of the debate had been moved.

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Sierra Leonean proposal to postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 until the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Emirates, a recorded vote was taken by roll call.

Zambia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Zambia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon,¹ Germany (Federal Republic of), Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Burma, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela.

The Sierra Leonean proposal was rejected by 68 votes to 45, with 16 abstentions.

14. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait) whole-heartedly associated himself with certain comments made at the preceding meeting by the representative of Barbados: as a sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation fully agreed that what was at issue was not the problem of Palestine, nor the Arab-Israeli conflict, nor the situation in the Middle East, but the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 related to one form of racism. That aspect must indeed be dissociated from other aspects in relation to the Arab-Israeli conflict; the question to be asked was whether zionism and its practices did or did

¹ The Gabonese delegation subsequently stated that it had voted against the Sierra Leonean proposal but that the vote had been incorrectly recorded.

not involve racism and racial discrimination. In other words, to use the phraseology of article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, did zionism include discrimination based on "race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin"?

15. The draft resolution referred to zionism, which was not a vague notion but a specific political movement which had begun at a precise moment—in 1897—at a precise place, namely, Basel, at the instigation of a specific individual, and had established a specific organization with precise objectives. His delegation maintained that that movement was racist both in its ideology and in its practices. It was racist in its ideology because that ideology was based on a central dogma which governed the whole Zionist ideal and its programme. According to that dogma, all the Jews of the world, believed to be united not only in a common faith but especially as members of an ethnic community, should create a State of Jews reserved for Jews alone, and in order to do so, they should leave their country of residence and migrate to the country selected for the purpose. That dogma was based on exclusivity, and the creation of that State of Jews required programmed measures: the coming of Jews from everywhere in the world to the chosen area and the expulsion of the indigenous non-Jews from the area. That twofold operation—the coming of the Jews and the expulsion of the non-Jews—found expression in a massive immigration programme and in a law, called the "law of return", according to which every Jew had the right to come to the chosen country as an "oleh" or immigrant settler. All of that had been foreseen from the beginnings of zionism, and in order to create an exclusively State of Jews in a region already populated with Arabs, the expulsion of the latter was imperative.

16. Was that criterion, which gave preference to some at the expense of others, a racial criterion? If it could not be demonstrated that zionism considered being a Jew as a matter of race, it was impossible to speak of racism. The fact was that, according to zionism, Jews were Jews primarily if they belonged to a specific ethnic community, as the initiator of zionism himself had stated. That had nothing to do with religion; it was the racial link that made a Jew a Jew, according to Herzl, the founder of zionism.

17. He read out extracts from the writings of Herzl which indicated that the Jews should create a State and that the programme established for that purpose presupposed bringing the Jews together in a specific area, with the simultaneous expulsion of that area's inhabitants. Thus, in its essence, in its dogma and in its programme, zionism could be truly seen as a form of racial discrimination.

18. With regard to the practices of zionism, he recalled that racism was a cancer which could not be contained. Once one began by making a racist distinction between Jews and non-Jews, the process was endless; for that reason, in Israel one could see not simply Jews in general but white Jews, oriental Jews, black Jews and, last of all, Palestinians. The oriental Jews had already rebelled several times since their settlement in Israel. What were their complaints? Although they made up two thirds of the population of the new State, the oriental Jews were very poorly represented

in the Government, the public services and the universities. The situation of black Jews was even worse. Simply to enter the territory of the new State, Falasha Jews from Ethiopia had to satisfy unrealistic conditions which were not required of any tourist. The black American Jews who had gone to Israel in 1969 by way of Liberia had also encountered a great deal of difficulty. In August 1971 they had raised the problem again, having failed to obtain Israeli nationality, and had called the Government racist; apparently the "law of return" they invoked did not apply to them.

19. There was another aspect of zionism which made it akin to the process of discrimination: everyone could, in fact, see the particular affinity between Israel and South Africa. Each time an attempt was made by the United Nations to isolate South Africa, it was observed that Israel strengthened its ties with that country. The General Assembly had already twice condemned the relations between Israel and South Africa. The development of those relations was no coincidence: there was in fact an organic affinity between zionism and *apartheid*.

20. Lastly, he drew the Committee's attention to two noted individuals. Firstly, he referred to Arnold Toynbee, a non-Zionist, who, in his work entitled *Experiences*,² observed that increasing emphasis was being placed today on respect for humanity but that at the same time there were more and more instances of massive destruction, whether in the genocide perpetrated by the Nazis, the *apartheid* that prevailed in South Africa or the expulsion of Palestinians from their country by Zionists. The second individual he mentioned was a Zionist, David Ben-Gurion, who had gone to South Africa in 1969 and told that country's Prime Minister that the white settlers had made a mistake and should have acted like Israel in order to avoid the troubles besetting them.

21. His delegation reaffirmed that zionism was based on a racist ideology and was implementing a racist programme, even against its own members. All the members of the Committee were firmly opposed to racism, and they should therefore act logically. What was at issue was not the Arab-Israeli conflict or the situation in the Middle East but racism, and in order to fight against racism, everyone must support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that Mali had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

23. Mr. GARMENT (United States of America) said he feared that the members of the Committee did not fully understand that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 asked them to commit one of the most grievous errors in the life of the United Nations. Under the guise of a programme to eliminate racism, the United Nations was at the point of officially endorsing anti-Semitism, one of the oldest and most virulent forms of racism known to mankind. That was an obscene act. The United States protested against such an act and felt obliged to warn the Committee that it would place the work of the United Nations in jeopardy. The draft resolution changed words with precise meanings into purveyors of confusion and destroyed the moral force of

the concept of racism. It widened the areas of agreement and disagreement, whereas the members of the Committee were assembled to overcome their differences, not to accentuate them.

24. Zionism was a movement whose objective was to preserve the survivors of a racial holocaust. By equating zionism with racism, the draft resolution discredited the good faith of those who were fighting against actual racism. Its adoption would encourage anti-Semitism and group hostility and make it impossible for some countries to co-operate in the elimination of racism and racial discrimination as a part of the work of the Decade.

25. Throughout its 30-year history, the United Nations had not lived by the force of majorities, nor by the force of arms. It had lived only because it had been thought that the nations of the world assembled together would give voice to the most decent and humane instincts of mankind, and from that thought had come the moral authority of the United Nations. However, in his delegation's view, that moral authority was at risk. For that reason, while his delegation supported draft resolutions A and B (A/10145, annex) and supported without reservation the work of the United Nations to combat racism and racial discrimination, it would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 and call upon other delegations to do likewise. If, however, the draft resolution was adopted, the three draft resolutions would become inseparably linked, and his delegation would vote in plenary meeting against all three of them.

26. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation could accept draft resolutions A and B. After lengthy negotiations, the text of draft resolution A had gained a consensus in the Economic and Social Council, and some members of the Third Committee had wished consequently to introduce some amendments to it which her delegation could support, including those contained in documents A/C.3/L.2155 and A/C.3/L.2156. With regard to the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2154, her delegation would be prepared to support a text that took into account the reservations expressed by the delegations of Venezuela (2121st meeting) and Ecuador (2122nd meeting) and the comments of the delegation of Bolivia (2132nd meeting), which it had found extremely constructive.

27. Her delegation could not, however, support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, which replaced the amendments previously submitted in document A/C.3/L.2157 and introduced a notion extraneous to the question that weakened the text of draft resolution A. The second preambular paragraph recalled General Assembly resolution 3151 G (XXVIII), which reflected an idea—namely, that zionism was to be equated with *apartheid*—that her delegation had been unable to accept at the time and could not now subscribe to. The Costa Rican delegation at the World Conference of the International Women's Year had likewise objected to the inclusion of zionism in the Declaration of Mexico. Lastly, her delegation could not support the operative paragraph, and would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution.

28. It had been said at the 2132nd meeting that it was not for Costa Rica and other small Latin American countries to take a decision on matters with which they were unfamiliar

² Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.

and which did not concern them; she wished to point out in that connexion that the size of a country or its remoteness from the place where a given event occurred could not prevent it from participating in certain debates in the United Nations when it deemed it appropriate. Costa Rica had signed the United Nations Charter and faithfully complied with its principles, especially the principle of the sovereign equality of States, and it would continue to do so.

29. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, moved the closure of the debate on the item under discussion, in accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure, and called for an immediate vote.

30. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), speaking on a point of order, noted that the Committee had already decided, at the 2130th meeting, to close the debate. He would like an opportunity to speak in order to explain his vote.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic having moved the closure of the debate in accordance with rule 117, he would now give the floor to the speakers opposing the closure.

32. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) asked whether it would be possible for him to explain his vote after the vote on the closure of the debate.

33. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee must decide to close the debate and proceed immediately to vote, with explanations of vote to be made after the voting.

34. Mr. RAE (Canada), speaking on a point of order, said that the question under discussion was extremely important. Some delegations had asked to be allowed to explain their vote before the voting, which would not be a misuse of the Committee's time; his delegation would also like to explain its vote before the voting.

35. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the Chairman intended to take a vote on the motion for closure of the debate without allowing members of the Committee who would like to explain their vote before the voting the time to do so. Closure of the debate was one thing and explanations of vote were another. Allowing explanations of vote before the voting was an established practice, and it would be most unfortunate if members of the Committee wishing to speak were denied the opportunity to do so.

36. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados), speaking on a point of order, said that the point raised by the representative of Mauritius was extremely pertinent. A motion to close the debate on the substance of the item under discussion was in order, but the discussion could not be closed in the middle of the explanations of vote; in the present case, rule 117 of the rules of procedure did not apply.

37. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that he agreed with the representatives of Mauritius and Barbados. Members of the Committee had chosen to take up a point which went to the heart of the debate—a debate which had for too long

preoccupied all mankind. His delegation therefore considered it unthinkable that anyone should be denied the right to express his views. He joined previous speakers in appealing to the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic to give serious thought to the consequences of his proposal.

38. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that he had moved the closure of the debate so that the Committee could proceed to vote, because the hour was late and the discussion had been very lengthy. If he had an assurance that explanations of vote before the vote would not mean having to adjourn the meeting and that the item under discussion could be disposed of by the end of the meeting, he would have no objection to such explanations being made. Otherwise, he could not withdraw his motion for closure of the debate.

39. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates), speaking on a point of order, observed that the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic had no intention of preventing members who wished to express their views, especially the representative of Barbados, from doing so. Nevertheless, he had noticed that some speakers had used explanations of vote before the voting to make substantive statements on the question under discussion. The Libyan representative was therefore quite justified in moving the closure of the debate under rule 117. He himself found it intolerable that some members should monopolize the time allotted for explanations of vote in order to obstruct the Committee's work. Members could explain their votes either before or after the voting, as was stated expressly in rule 128 of the rules of procedure.

40. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), speaking on a point of order, thanked the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic for not pressing his proposal that explanations of vote should be made after the voting. Any pressure, from whatever quarter, was quite out of place in the Committee. It was true that members were at present engaged in an ideological discussion, but it was precisely for the purpose of consultation and discussion that representatives of all nations were gathered together in the Committee. He therefore urged that established practices should be adhered to and that those wishing to explain their votes before the voting should be allowed to do so.

41. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, expressed regret that the Committee was becoming bogged down in procedural manoeuvring. The subject of the present debate was something which lay at the very heart of the ideology of the country he represented, as was true also of many other countries. It would be quite regrettable if the pressure that was being exerted for an immediate vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 caused the Committee to take a premature vote. If the question was to be put to the vote, it would be. However, it would be unfortunate to vote in an atmosphere of ill-feeling; time must be allowed for passions to subside. If some members of the Committee persisted in manoeuvring to achieve their ends, his delegation would be obliged, with great regret, to do the same.

42. He believed that the vote on the motion should be deferred, and he moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

43. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that the United States representative's intervention was out of order. Two speakers opposing the closure of the debate had already been heard, in accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure, and the motion should therefore be immediately put to the vote.

44. Mr. GARMENT (United States of America) pointed out that his delegation's motion for adjournment of the meeting had precedence over the motion for adjournment of the debate.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States motion for adjournment of the meeting.

The motion to adjourn the meeting was rejected by 65 votes to 40, with 21 abstentions.

46. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said he felt obliged to insist that the Libyan motion for closure of the debate should be immediately put to the vote.

47. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), speaking on a point of order, and supported by Miss BEAGLE (New Zealand) and Mr. RAE (Canada), said that he wished to explain his vote before the voting. If necessary, he would request that a vote should also be taken on whether delegations would be allowed to explain their views.

48. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius), speaking on a point of order, noted that under rule 128 of the rules of procedure the Chairman could permit members to explain their votes either before or after the voting. He suggested that the Chairman should limit the time to be allowed for such explanations, as rule 128 authorized him to do.

49. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), speaking on a point of order, said that, whatever procedure was adopted, the Committee must vote at the current meeting on the draft resolutions before it.

50. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados), speaking on a point of order, said he understood that the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic had moved the closure of the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. He suggested that the Chairman should immediately put the Libyan proposal to the vote and then allow the representatives who so wished to explain their vote.

51. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic) explained that he had requested the closure of the debate on the issue covered in subitem (a) of agenda item 68 and a vote on all the draft resolutions before the Committee. He fully supported what the representative of Barbados had said.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion by the Libyan Arab Republic to close the debate on subitem (a) of item 68.

At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken by roll call.

The Ivory Coast, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

Abstaining: Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia, Bahamas, Barbados, Botswana, Burma, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana.

The motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 66 votes to 29, with 32 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it three draft resolutions: the draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolutions 1938 A and B (LVIII) (A/10145), annex, drafts A and B) and the amendments pertaining thereto (A/C.3/L.2154, A/C.3/L.2155 and A/C.3/L.2156) and draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. He invited representatives who so wished to explain their vote before the vote but urged them to be as brief as possible.

54. Mr. WILSON (Liberia) said, with reference to the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, that resolution 77 (XII), on the question of Palestine, had been adopted at Kampala by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU but had not been adopted unanimously; the Governments of Ghana, Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone had expressed reservations. The Government of Zaire had also opposed the resolution. The resolution concerning the Middle East and the occupied territories had not been unanimously adopted either, for the Governments of Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone had expressed reservations. The Government of Zaire had voted against. His delegation wished to state that it did not share the viewpoint of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, which equated *apartheid* with zionism, and would not support that text.

Mrs. Shahani (Philippines) Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

55. Mrs. MASSON (Canada) pointed out that for more than a quarter of a century successive Canadian Govern-

ments had expressed their abhorrence for the policies of *apartheid* as practised in South Africa. For that reason, her delegation would support the draft resolutions recommended by the Council, despite several minor difficulties of an essentially technical nature.

56. At the same time, her delegation considered that, if draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was adopted, it could well corrupt and distort the goals of the Decade. That resolution was essentially a restatement, in a new but even more unacceptable form, of the amendments originally introduced in document A/C.3/L.2157. Her delegation regarded those amendments as inappropriate because they sought to link the concept of zionism with the racial doctrine of *apartheid*. Her delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 and, whenever such unacceptable elements were added to draft resolutions which Canada had otherwise wished to support, her delegation would not only vote against such proposals themselves but, whenever appropriate, would either vote against or abstain on the final texts affected by them.

57. It should therefore be made quite clear that, if draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was adopted, the Canadian delegation would review its vote on the draft resolutions recommended by the Council when those texts came before the plenary.

58. Mr. TUERK (Austria) said his delegation was pleased to note that the Economic and Social Council had achieved a consensus on the draft resolutions concerning the implementation of the Programme for the Decade. His delegation had certain reservation on particular points in the drafts but, on the whole, they were satisfactory. His delegation had expressed the hope that the Third Committee would be able to maintain the consensus already reached by the Economic and Social Council. It would therefore deeply regret having to reconsider its attitude towards draft resolutions A and B; however, such a reevaluation would become necessary if the Third Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. In such a case, the Austrian delegation would have to withdraw its support for the draft resolutions on the Decade. Austria was fully aware of the serious problems arising in the Middle East conflict and of the need to reach a durable peace settlement in that region. The peoples of the Middle East—not least the Palestinian people—must be enabled to establish a just and lasting peace, as United Nations decisions had long been demanding. However, his delegation did not find it conducive to the efforts of the Third Committee to further the cause of eradicating racism and racial discrimination by introducing the specific problems of the Middle East into the deliberations and decisions on that topic. Those problems were unrelated to the item before the Committee. His delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

Mr. Šmíd (Czechoslovakia) resumed the Chair.

59. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. It was not necessary for the Third Committee to attempt to define in scientific terms what zionism was, or to go into its legendary origins. What was important, however, was to consider what zionism had come to mean in actuality. There was no doubt

that there was such a movement, such a force as zionism. For those who believed in zionism, it doubtless had many virtues, but for those who felt its adverse effects, it was clearly a form of racial discrimination. The Third Committee should be concerned with what zionism meant to the Arab people of some 20 Arab States and, more particularly, with what it had done to the Arab people of Palestine, Lebanon, Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Egypt, which had become victims of aggression. Clearly, zionism had deprived the Arab people of their national rights and of the right to self-determination. It had also caused tensions and conflicts and, indeed, posed the threat of conflict on a wider scale. It was surely understandable that the victims of zionism should regard it as a form of racial discrimination and it was therefore proper for the General Assembly also to recognize it as such. By equating zionism with racism, one was anti-racist but certainly not anti-Semitic. To condone the evil effects of zionism would be giving the green light to various other forms of racism endemic in human societies.

60. Mr. STAHL (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Nordic countries, pointed out that, as everyone knew, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden condemned racism and racial discrimination and also had taken part in the struggle against racial discrimination by supporting the victims of *apartheid*. In recent years, the Third Committee had been able to reach a consensus on the adoption of the principal resolution concerning racial discrimination and, with regard to the texts dealing with that question which the Committee had before it, they had received a consensus in the Economic and Social Council. The Nordic delegations believed that only unanimity could ensure the achievement of a common objective. They deplored the introduction of a new element—the references to zionism—which could radically change the concept of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. For them, to state that zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination was totally unacceptable. If draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was adopted, the delegations of the Nordic countries would be compelled, in the plenary, to vote against the two draft resolutions in document A/10145. In doing so, they would have in no way changed their views concerning the abominable practices of racism and racial discrimination.

61. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) said that his country had not severed diplomatic relations with Israel but that at the OAU summit meeting at Kampala it had not expressed any reservation with regard to the item under consideration; in view of the instructions which his delegation had just received from its Government and the consultations which it had held with members of the African group, he would have no alternative but to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

62. Mr. CATO (Ghana) said that Ghana had always taken a leading role in matters concerning violations of human rights and had, in addition, instituted special machinery for the implementation of the Programme for the Decade. Ghana's offer to host the world conference on the Decade, to be held in 1978, bore witness to its interest in the Decade's objectives.

63. Its concern to ensure the success of the Programme for the Decade and of the world conference had led its

delegation to join with others in seeking a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. It had been particularly anxious to ensure that the solidarity manifested on the occasion of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and the two draft resolutions contained in resolutions 1938 A and B (LVIII) of the Economic and Social Council was maintained, for that solidarity was now threatened by the debates that had taken place on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 and by the statement made on behalf of the countries which were members of the European Economic Community. That statement was regrettable in many respects, for the countries on whose behalf it had been made threatened to withhold support from the United Nations in its efforts to combat *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination. If that was the correct interpretation of the statement, then countries like Ghana which believed in the equality and dignity of mankind and were committed to the elimination of the humiliations inflicted on human beings in South Africa and elsewhere would have no choice but to draw the inevitable conclusions.

64. Obviously Israel was guilty of an injustice in continuing to occupy certain Arab territories and denying the Palestinian Arabs the right to their homeland. That situation constituted in itself a gross denial of the fundamental rights of the Palestinians. Thus in supporting the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people Ghana had done no more than it had done in supporting the liberation struggle in southern Africa and elsewhere.

65. Even though Ghana was sympathetic to the spirit underlying draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, his delegation, on instructions from its Government, would, in view of the considerations which he had set forth, abstain in the voting on that text.

66. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that his delegation considered that the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was of the utmost importance. In its sincere desire to see the world eventually freed from racist prejudices, it supported whole-heartedly all measures aimed at combating those prejudices. Unfortunately, it was obliged to recognize that certain members of the Committee were not hesitating to jeopardize the consensus which had emerged with respect to the Decade, for that was what would probably be the result if draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was adopted. His delegation would vote against that draft. It was firmly opposed to any attempt to identify zionism with racism. To identify one with the other would be to distort the facts and to add to the obstacles standing in the way of a settlement of the Middle East situation by exacerbating the mutual hostility of the protagonists. Australia, which was a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, felt that all those who had signed that instrument had a grave moral responsibility to fulfil in that connexion. It would be regrettable if efforts to combat discrimination which had been unanimously agreed upon were jeopardized by the adoption for exclusively political reasons of a resolution that had nothing to do with the question. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 should be examined very thoroughly; a consensus, without which the Decade would make no sense, must not be compromised before the General Assembly by a hasty vote.

67. Miss de la MAZA (Dominican Republic) said that the Dominican Republic supported without reservation the right of peoples to self-determination and the struggle against racism and that it condemned *apartheid* and wished to see it totally eliminated along with all other forms of racial discrimination. However, it could not approve draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 in its existing form, for it considered the identification of zionism with racial discrimination totally unjustified. It would therefore vote in favour of draft resolutions A and B in document A/10145 and against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

68. Mr. BADIMA (Ethiopia) said that his delegation supported draft resolutions A and B as they had been recommended by the Council. On the other hand, it would not be able to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 because his country was anxious, after the long years of struggle waged by the United Nations against racial discrimination, to avoid jeopardizing the consensus which had emerged with respect to the Decade at a time when the goal appeared to be in sight. The introduction at the last minute of new objectives might sow confusion and disrupt the efforts which had been made to achieve unity, for to identify zionism with *apartheid* was inconceivable. Zionism posed a problem which should be examined separately. Only after thorough consideration would it be possible to contemplate taking action in connexion with it. Therefore it would be advisable to defer until the thirty-first session of the General Assembly a vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159. If the latter was put to the vote, he would vote against it.

69. Mr. HERZOG (Israel) said that at the current meeting the most unbelievable nonsense about zionism had been uttered; what was more, it had been uttered by representatives of countries where the archetypes of racism were to be found. Three million people lived freely in Israel. Anyone could go there, travel there and depart freely. Those were the facts. Much had been said about facts. Why was racism not examined in those places where it prevailed? The reply was simple. Once again Israel, because it was a small country and because it was Jewish, was being made a scapegoat. He expressed indignation at the effrontery of those who made accusations of racism against a people which more than any other had been, for centuries, the victim of racism in, *inter alia*, the countries which were the sponsors of the draft resolution in question. His delegation would vote against a text which, from beginning to end, was permeated by the most flagrant anti-Semitism, which bore no relationship whatever to the question of racial discrimination that the Committee was considering, and which, in addition, was likely to destroy the consensus that had emerged with respect to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, so that the Decade would be meaningless. Consequently, his delegation would also not vote in favour of the draft resolutions recommended by the Council.

70. What was happening in the Committee made that day a sad one for the United Nations. The Israeli people constituted a small people which prided itself on a long and glorious history. It had survived all persecutions. It would survive the shameful exhibition which was taking place that day. He wished to assure all those who had supported the Israeli people of the latter's gratitude; as for the others, it

would never forget the base action which they were about to take.

71. Miss BEAGLE (New Zealand) said that her delegation attached great importance to the Decade. It welcomed the consensus which had emerged with respect to draft resolutions A and B in document A/10145. But it was firmly opposed to associating draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 with those texts. Zionism must not be confused with racism. Now that all the members of the Committee had agreed on the need to concentrate efforts on the objectives of the Decade, were some of them going to bring to nought the consensus which it was hoped had been firmly established? If the draft resolution was put to the vote, New Zealand, to its very great regret, would be obliged to reconsider its position with regard to the draft resolutions recommended by the Council.

72. Mr. SANCHEZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation was prepared to support the draft resolutions that the Council had recommended. However, it would vote against the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2154 concerning migrant workers because it felt that that question had nothing to do with racial discrimination.

73. The CHAIRMAN invited the Secretary of the Committee to read out the amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII) and reproduced in the annex to document A/10145 as draft resolution A.

74. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the first of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2155, proposing the addition of a new preambular paragraph.

75. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), speaking on a point of order, observed that there appeared to be a consensus with regard to that text.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendment without a vote.

It was so decided.

77. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2154, also proposing the addition of a new preambular paragraph.

The amendment was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

78. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the second amendment in document A/C.3/L.2154, as modified at the 2121st meeting of the Committee by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany with the agreement of the sponsors. The new operative paragraph 3 (i) read:

“Ensuring the cessation of all discriminatory measures against migrant workers and extending to them treatment equal to that provided for nationals of the host country with regard to human rights and to the provisions of their labour legislation.”

The amendment was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

79. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) said that at the 2121st meeting the representative of Nigeria had orally proposed an amendment to the effect that the following words should be added at the end of operative paragraph 5 (b): “in particular, to organize an international competition to select an appropriate emblem for the Decade and the printing of posters containing the emblem for wide distribution;”.

80. He drew the Committee’s attention to the statement of the administrative and financial implications of that proposal in document A/C.3/638.

The amendment was adopted by 124 votes to none.

81. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the second amendment in document A/C.3/L.2155, concerning operative paragraph 7.

82. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement on the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

83. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement on paragraph 7 as amended.

Operative paragraph 7, as amended, was adopted.

84. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the third amendment in document A/C.3/L.2155, concerning operative paragraph 8.

85. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement on the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

86. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement on paragraph 8, as amended.

Operative paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted.

87. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the fourth amendment in document A/C.3/L.2155, concerning operative paragraph 10.

88. Mr. BAGBENI (Zaire) drew attention to a typographical error in the French text of the amendment; the word “*que*” after “*activités*” should be replaced by “*qui*”.

The amendment was adopted by 126 votes to none.

89. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the fifth amendment in document A/C.3/L.2155, proposing the addition of a new operative paragraph 11. He pointed out that the sponsors had announced that the words “racial discrimination and other similar phenomena” were to be replaced by “and racial discrimination”.

The amendment was adopted by 124 votes to none.

90. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendment in document A/C.3/L.2156, proposing the addition of a new operative paragraph 11 (paragraph 12 in view of the adoption of the preceding amendment).

The amendment was adopted by 126 votes to none.

91. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A, as a whole.

The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 A (LVIII), as amended, was adopted by 126 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

92. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the draft resolution recommended by the Council in its resolution 1938 B (LVIII), reproduced as draft resolution B in the annex to document A/10145 and relating to the world conference on the Decade, drew the Committee's attention to General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV), paragraph 10 of which read:

"Decides that United Nations bodies may hold sessions away from their established headquarters when a Government issuing an invitation for a session to be held within its territory has agreed to defray, after consultation with the Secretary-General as to their nature and possible extent, the actual additional costs directly or indirectly involved;"

93. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution B.

The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1938 B (LVIII) was adopted by 126 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

94. Mr. BENUZZI (Italy) stated that his delegation had voted against draft resolution B by mistake; it had intended to vote in favour of it.

95. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159.

96. Miss CABALLERO (Mexico), speaking on a point of order, requested, in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, that the preambular paragraphs should be voted on separately.

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 104 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 26, with 27 abstentions.

The third preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 21, with 32 abstentions.

The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions.

The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 74 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions.

97. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159, as a whole, to the vote.

At the request of the representative of Israel, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen.

Against: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singaôre, Swaziland, Togo, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Botswana, Colombia.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2159 was adopted by 70 votes to 29, with 27 abstentions.

98. Mr. LUGO (Nicaragua) requested that an error in the results of the vote on the third preambular paragraph should be corrected. His delegation had intended to vote against that paragraph, and not, as had been recorded, in favour of it.

99. The CHAIRMAN said that if no other delegation wished to explain its vote, he would take it that consideration of subitem (a) of agenda item 68 had been completed.

100. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) said that she would explain her delegation's vote at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.