



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 83rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. FRANCISCO SÁ CARNEIRO, PRIME MINISTER OF PORTUGAL

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. FRANCISCO SÁ CARNEIRO, PRIME MINISTER OF PORTUGAL

1. The CHAIRMAN speaking on the Committee's and his own behalf, expressed sympathy to the Government and people of Portugal in connexion with the untimely and tragic death of the Prime Minister of Portugal, Mr. Francisco Sá Carneiro.

2. Mrs. PADUA (Portugal), speaking on behalf of her delegation and Government, thanked the Committee for its expression of sympathy.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1, L.76, L.96)

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1 as amended

3. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had found the original draft resolution too limited in scope, but had been able to vote in favour of the draft as amended, particularly because of the Malagasy subamendment referring to racial intolerance, hatred and terror.

4. Ms. MONTEIRO (Mozambique) said that her country, which had been among the original sponsors of the draft resolution, was seriously concerned with the subject of measures to be taken against nazism, fascism and neo-fascism. It had voted against the amendments because some of them, especially the second, fifth, tenth and eleventh, were against the spirit of the original draft.

5. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that many areas in the world were suffering from nazism, fascism and neo-fascism, especially Palestine and South Africa. His delegation would like to see that scourge condemned, as it was in the draft resolution, although it would have preferred a more comprehensive resolution. His delegation was pleased that the Committee had adopted the draft resolution, and it understood that apartheid and zionism would be condemned in another draft resolution.

6. Mr. SHESTACK (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because it failed to adopt a global approach with respect to nazism, fascism and neo-fascism and contained phraseology which made it less than useful. The United States appreciated the efforts of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic to change the language; however, there had been no time for a consensus to be reached. He emphasized the United States Government's opposition to nazism and fascism and reminded the Committee that his Government had not made any pacts with Nazi or Fascist Governments during the Second World War. In any case, the best way to curb the spread of nazism and fascism was through the free exchange of ideas, as reflected in the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The General Assembly, in the fourth preambular paragraph of its resolution 2839 (XXVI), had stated that the best bulwark against nazism and racial discrimination was the establishment and maintenance of democratic

/...

(Mr. Shestack, United States)

institutions and that a political system which was based on freedom and effective participation by the people in the conduct of public affairs, and under which economic and social conditions were such as to ensure a decent standard of living for the population, made it impossible for fascism, nazism or other ideologies based on terror to succeed. Governments should not adopt totalitarian tactics to repress dissident views.

7. Mr. EWORO (Equatorial Guinea), Mrs. SANGARE (Guinea), Mr. MUCORLOR (Liberia), Mrs. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka) and Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) said that if their delegations had been present during the voting on the draft resolution they would have voted in favour of it.

8. Mr. ERRAZURIZ (Chile) said that his Government was against all forms of totalitarianism, including colonialism, neo-colonialism, expansionism and hegemonism, and any other ideology based on hatred and intolerance, and it had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. In Chile's Constitution there was a provision the purpose of which was to prevent the dissemination of totalitarian doctrines. However, the problem was more than an internal one, as could be seen from recent events. Like Mussolini's Italy in 1936, a super-Power had recently invaded a smaller country. The Soviet Union, which proclaimed itself to be peace-loving, should not resort to the same policies that it had suffered from in 1941 by imposing fascism on another country.

9. Mrs. ITGEL (Mongolia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because Mongolia fully shared the ideals and goals of its sponsors. The people of Mongolia were well aware that fascism was a serious threat to the security of peoples throughout the world. In the light of ever-increasing manifestations of such doctrines, measures should be taken to suppress nazism, fascism and neo-fascism, and all other ideologies based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror.

10. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but would not have accepted it without the amendments. Forty years ago, France and other countries had participated in the struggle against nazism and fascism, which had led to victory and the founding of the United Nations. However, it was inadmissible that the General Assembly should limit its struggle to nazism and fascism. All totalitarian régimes which were founded on racial intolerance, hatred and terror should be opposed. His delegation was pleased that the Committee had overwhelmingly supported the draft resolution, including the amendments which had made it more universal in scope. The dangers resulting from the resurgence of nazism and fascism in recent times must be opposed universally and constantly.

11. Mr. ROME (Israel) said that it was natural for his country to support the draft resolution because no other people had suffered more than the Jewish people from nazism and fascism. Six million Jews, or one out of three in the world, had been massacred during the Second World War. In the light of the recent recrudescence in Europe of anti-Semitism, whether in its traditional form or in the new form called "anti-zionism", his delegation viewed with satisfaction the unopposed adoption of the draft resolution.

/...

12. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that although Denmark had consistently supported efforts against nazism and fascism and would continue to do so, his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because it could not support the revised text. Denmark had not been able to become a party to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity because of the broad scope of the crimes covered by the Convention and the political elements reflected in that text. That Convention was mentioned in General Assembly resolution 2839 (XXVI), in the voting on which Denmark had abstained and which was referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. His delegation felt that the question could be taken up more appropriately by other forums such as the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

13. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as revised and amended, for the same reasons as explained by his delegation at the 1902nd meeting of the Committee after the vote on General Assembly resolution 2839 (XXVI). His delegation had abstained not because it approved of war crimes or nazism, fascism, neo-fascism or racial intolerance or any form of totalitarian ideology. Norwegian legislation had been revised to bring it into line with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Norway could not accept, however, the principle of non-applicability of statutory limitations or proposals which might be contrary to freedom of expression and political activity.

14. Mr. GOODEN (Jamaica) said that his delegation, which had voted in favour of the draft resolution, was surprised at the suggestion of one representative that the problem of nazism and fascism was the concern of Europeans alone. That was an affront to the memory of the thousands of Caribbean people who had given their lives during the Second World War. A resurgence of nazism and fascism was taking place in both the old world and the new. His delegation fervently hoped that mankind would be spared a repetition of the experience of the 1930s and 1940s. Those who claimed that such ideologies were merely sick and insignificant movements which did not merit the attention of the international community and which should be given protection in the name of freedom were taking an approach to which his delegation could not subscribe.

15. Mrs. PADUA (Portugal) said that Portugal condemned all forms of totalitarianism and believed that all its manifestations jeopardized world peace and international security and constituted an obstacle to the development of friendly relations between States and peoples and to the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the exercise proposed in it encompassed all totalitarian practices and ideologies without exception; in the modern world, the danger could arise from any source.

16. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that there should be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of people in the United Kingdom regarded manifestations of neo-nazism and other racist activities as distasteful and unacceptable. The United Kingdom was a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and it had extensive and well-applied machinery to deal

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

with any cases of racial discrimination and incitement to racial hatred. Any ideology based on hatred, whether inspired by race, religion or class, was unacceptable and was contrary to the traditions of the United Kingdom. It was even more unacceptable when the activities and beliefs in question led to violence. That applied equally to all such manifestations, from whatever quarter. His delegation questioned the sincerity of the draft resolution, believing that the original motivation was propagandist. Although the draft had been much improved in the course of negotiations, his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on it because of its continued reservations about certain provisions. The countries which had abstained included several countries which had played a leading role in the fight against nazism during the Second World War. The draft resolution was not the balanced and unpoliticized resolution his delegation would have wished to see adopted with respect to a subject which, it agreed, had serious implications.

17. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Soviet people had defended the freedom and independence of their country and their social system in the bitter struggle against nazism and had sacrificed 20 million lives for the great victory over fascism and militarism which had resulted in the freedom of many peoples of the world and made possible the establishment of the United Nations. In those circumstances it could not be indifferent to the danger of the revival of fascism and nazism in whatever form or place and it had therefore consistently supported and voted for draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1. It was significant that the sponsors of the draft resolution included States from all the continents except Australia and from four of the five regional groups, and that the draft resolution had been adopted by an overwhelming majority of members of the Committee. Those facts, and the statements made in support of the draft resolution, showed that serious concern about the danger of the spread of nazism and fascism was shared by the entire international community and that it was a problem that did not affect the European countries alone.

18. His delegation, in its statement to the Committee on item 12, and the delegations of many other countries in various parts of the world, had drawn attention to the serious threat posed by the recent upsurge in a number of countries in the activities of Fascist and neo-Nazi groups whose ideas were based on theories of racial supremacy and racial exclusiveness. Those organizations were operating increasingly openly and actively, were conscripting new members and were setting up armed formations, and there had been a number of victims of their terrorist activities. The activities of such groups and organizations were aimed against non-whites, migrant workers and those fighting against racism, racial discrimination and apartheid. Moreover, their criminal activities went unpunished and the local authorities often connived with such organizations. A typical example was the recent acquittal by a United States court of a group of Ku Klux Klan members and neo-Nazis who had killed five participants in an anti-nazi demonstration. In the conditions of heightened chauvinism and the open advocacy of the cult of violence in certain countries, Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist ideologies and organizations were especially dangerous. It was therefore most alarming that the criminal activities of neo-Nazi and Fascist groups were being broadly co-ordinated at the international level, thus creating a potential threat to international peace and security. His delegation had

/...

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

been surprised and disappointed at the position taken by the delegations of certain Western countries on the question of the struggle against nazism and fascism and their attempts to divert the Committee's attention from those burning problems and to make the draft resolution a meaningless document which would not be binding on anyone. It was very gratifying that the Committee, in rebutting those attempts, had adopted an important document aimed at promoting effective measures for the fight against the evil of fascism and nazism.

19. Some delegations, under cover of demagogic assertions and provocative insinuations together with falsification of history, had cast doubt on the importance and timeliness of the draft resolution. They had even alleged that it was propagandist and was aimed against certain countries. His delegation wished to stress that the draft resolution was aimed not against any country but against nazism, fascism and neo-nazism and the conditions which allowed such activities to develop with impunity. It therefore was in harmony with the interests of the peoples of countries in which criminal organizations propagated and practised inhuman ideologies and in the interests of all countries and peoples concerned about the preservation of international peace and security; it aimed at eliminating the danger of the resurgence of nazism and fascism so as to ensure that those evils including such manifestation as the apartheid régime in South Africa, were wiped out once and for all.

20. His delegation believed that the implementation of such rights as the right to freedom of association and freedom of expression could not in any way be used as justification for avoiding the adoption of effective measures to prohibit the propagation of the inhuman ideologies of nazism, fascism and neo-fascism and ban organizations propagating such ideologies. That view was reflected in the Declaration of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination held in 1978. Moreover, the Declaration and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination made it clear that any racial ideology or theory was criminal and called for the prohibition of organizations propagating such theories.

21. It was particularly significant that the draft resolution had been adopted on the thirty-fifth anniversary of the great victory over the forces of fascism and militarism and the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The draft resolution was an expression of deep respect for the memory of the millions who had perished in Europe, Asia and elsewhere fighting the evils of fascism, nazism, racism and colonialism. It not only condemned nazism and fascism but also provided for the adoption of effective measures to prevent the spread of nazism, fascism and neo-fascism and extinguish any hotbeds of such activities. He was deeply convinced that as a result of the adoption of the draft resolution the Commission on Human Rights and subsequent sessions of the General Assembly would take further effective steps to exclude the possibility of the spread of the "brown plague".

22. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that Australia had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. It had hoped that the text would be adopted without a vote. It was not entirely convinced that the motives of the sponsors were all they appeared

/...

(Ms. Wells, Australia)

to be. Australia had no hesitation in defending its credentials as a country which was firmly opposed to nazism, fascism and all forms of neo-fascism and a country in which liberal and democratic traditions were well established. It was concerned about the implications of the draft resolution as to where Nazi and Fascist activities were taking place and about the measures proposed to be taken against such activities. Her delegation did not agree with the interpretation of the purpose of the draft resolution just put forward by one delegation and did not believe that the issues it raised were of such burning importance as that delegation claimed; it believed that the draft resolution would have been better balanced if it had taken a broader look at the general problems of totalitarian practices. It was somewhat surprising that the sponsors of the draft resolution, after voting against certain amendments in document A/C.3/35/L.96, had in the end voted in favour of the same changes as a result of negotiations. The final draft had been considerably improved but her delegation had abstained in the voting on it because it did not believe that the issues required the degree of attention that the sponsors thought they did, especially in view of the broader problems which should be addressed in considering the question of totalitarianism.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.76

23. Mr. DANОВI (Italy) said that after consultations with various delegations, he had revised the draft resolution in the hope that it could be adopted without a vote. The sixth preambular paragraph would now read: "Also noting that the Secretary-General states in his report that while the Division meets the technical criteria for a Centre, as set forth in his report on organizational nomenclature in the Secretariat (A/C.5/32/17), he believes that further consideration of the matter is required;". Secondly, the two operative paragraphs would be replaced by the following single operative paragraph: "Requests the Secretary-General to keep this question under consideration with a view to redesignating the Division of Human Rights as a Centre for Human Rights when he deems it appropriate, taking into account the views expressed by Member States at the thirty-fifth session."

24. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that the views expressed on the matter had been those of a vocal minority and he wondered how the Secretary-General would take into account the views of the majority of Members who had not spoken on the issue. He wondered whether the Secretary-General should not be requested to seek the views of Member States by communicating with them.

25. Mr. DANОВI (Italy) said that his delegation believed that the decision to redesignate the Division as a Centre fell entirely within the institutional powers of the Secretary-General. In so doing, however, the Secretary-General could take into account not only the views expressed at the current session but others communicated to him by interested delegations.

26. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that even as revised, the draft resolution was still somewhat vague. The statement of the Secretary-General referred to in the draft had been made at the thirty-second session and she wondered what had happened between then and the present time; in other words, did the Secretary-General still hold those views?

/...

27. Mr. GLAJEL (Syrian Arab Republic) asked whether the purpose of the draft resolution was to request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session so that it could study the matter and then take a decision or to have the Secretary-General himself decide on the redesignation and then inform the General Assembly of the action he had taken.
28. Mr. DANOVI (Italy) said that it was not the purpose of the draft resolution to have the Secretary-General submit a report; the decision to redesignate the Division lay with the Secretary-General, himself.
29. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation believed the Division did an excellent job under difficult circumstances and it was high time it was redesignated as a Centre. There were comparable bodies within the United Nations with comparable duties that were designated as Centres. The elevation of the Division to the level of a Centre did not involve financial implications because the staff would remain the same. The Division already met the criteria for a Centre and the Committee now had the opportunity of so redesignating it. His delegation believed that by allowing the Division to retain an inferior status the Committee might appear to be suggesting by implication that human rights programmes occupied an inferior place among the concerns of the United Nations.
30. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation too felt that it was high time the Division was accorded the status of a Centre. While his delegation agreed with the representative of Italy that it was within the mandate of the Secretary-General to redesignate the Division, he believed that the draft resolution should indicate clearly to the Secretary-General that it was the desire of the Committee that he decide favourably on the redesignation.
31. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would request a separate vote on the phrase "while the Division meets the technical criteria for a Centre, as set forth in his report on organizational nomenclature in the Secretariat (A/C.5/32/17)" in the sixth preambular paragraph.
32. Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would have preferred it if the draft resolution had not been revised because, as it had originally stood, it would have been clear to the Secretary-General what the Committee wished him to do. His delegation could have supported the draft resolution in its original form.
33. Miss NAGA (Egypt) proposed that the phrase "at the thirty-fifth session" at the end of the new operative paragraph be replaced by the words "in this connexion".
34. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that his delegation was surprised at the reluctance in the Committee to redesignate the Division as a Centre. Perhaps the Committee would prefer to take a decision on the draft as it had originally been worded.
35. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that what was before it was a draft resolution revised by its sponsor.

36. Ms. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said that despite that fact her delegation after hearing the statement by the representative of Ireland, had the impression that there was a broad measure of support within the Committee for the redesignation of the Division as a Centre. No one had expressed opposition to the designation and it was well known that in recent years increased demands had been made on the Division. Her delegation therefore did not understand the reluctance to change its name.

37. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) drew attention to the numbering of the operative paragraphs in the Spanish text, which was out of line with the English and French versions.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary would ensure that these errors were corrected.

39. Mr. ABDUL-AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) proposed that consideration of the draft should be postponed and that the Committee should not take a decision on it until after it had completed its work on all the other draft resolutions before it.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the proposal by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

41. It was so decided.

42. Mr. AL-GHAZALI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative, when addressing himself at the previous meeting to the amendments introduced by the representative of Jordan to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.87, had said that those amendments were applicable to the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and to Iraq's occupation of Khuzistan. It was the custom of representatives of that entity to depart from or to distort any subject under debate in any Committee. The Zionist representative claimed to be concerned about Iran's territory and human rights in Iran. He would like to set the Zionist representative's mind at rest by reiterating the assurances of his Government that Iraq was prepared to withdraw from every inch of Iranian territory whenever the Iranian authorities recognized the legitimate rights of Iraq and its complete sovereignty over its waterways and its territory. It was clear that the Zionist representative had been trying to legitimize the Zionists' own hostile and expansionist policies by making that false comparison, which was in itself a condemnation of them.

43. Mr. MOEANI (Iran) said that the representative of Iraq, abusing the right of reply, had tried in vain to justify a blatant breach by his Government of a principle of the United Nations Charter. At the very time that Iraq had been trying to mislead the General Assembly about its barbaric action against the people of Iran the Iraqi Army had been stationed miles deep in Iranian territory and had engaged in indiscriminate shelling and bombing of residential areas and even used highly destructive surface-to-surface missiles. Its shameless defence of aggression and barbarism in Iran was designed to promote the interests of the imperialist dictator who was ruling Iraq. Iraq claimed that it had no territorial claims against Iran yet it had already changed the name of the province of Khuzistan to Arabistan and changed the names of two towns.

44. Mr. AL-GHAZALI (Iraq) said that Iraq did not believe in war or in the use of force in international relations. As its record proved, it had always adhered to the letter and spirit of its international commitments. At the same time, it could not tolerate any threat to or encroachment on its sovereignty and dignity, and it was ready to make any sacrifice to protect its legitimate rights and vital interests. Iraq had responded positively to the various appeals and efforts which had been made to stop the fighting and find a peaceful settlement. It believed in the peaceful settlement of disputes and, as a developing country, it needed all its energy and resources for social and economic development. Yet it could not tolerate any encroachment on its legitimate rights, security, peace and well-being.

45. Mr. MOEANI (Iran) said that the allegations of the representative of Iraq were absolutely baseless. It was not the first time that an aggressive and expansionist régime had tried to acquire territory through the use of force and had put forward ridiculous excuses for its actions. It was obvious that the arguments put forward by Iraq would suffer the same fate as similar arguments put forward on previous occasions by other aggressors.

46. Mr. FARIS (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Iran had no right to come to the Committee to distort facts and resort to falsification when the Prime Minister of Iran had openly said that he did not recognize the Security Council and a member of the Iranian delegation had referred to the United Nations as an organization of the devil.

47. Mr. SHESTACK (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in his statement the representative of the Soviet Union had been critical of various trials in the United States. Normally that representative was much better informed, and he certainly had the opportunity to be better informed since he was stationed in the United States. In trials in the United States, every defendant had the right to a jury trial, counsel of his choice, an open courtroom, the right to confront witnesses and the right of appeal. All those were rights of due process guaranteed by the United States Constitution and reflected in international instruments. If the Soviet Union would open its courtrooms and allow defendants counsel of their choice, if it had allowed fair trials in cases such as the Sharansky case, the Orlov case and others, then it would be in a better position to criticize proceedings in the United States. The representative of the Soviet Union was hardly in a position to criticize free, open and fair trials in the United States.

48. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he regretted that the Chairman had not allowed him to exercise his right of reply at the time it had been requested. Instead, the Chairman had allowed the representative of the Soviet Union to make a lengthy statement on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1 on measures to be taken against nazism, racism and neo-fascism. If delegations believed that the representative of the Soviet Union was really concerned about migrant workers, racial minorities and oppressed peoples anywhere, then they would believe anything. They merely had to look at the manner in which the Soviet Union treated its own people. Finally, it was a matter of historical record that the Soviet Union had entered the Second World War because it had been attacked by its ally, Nazi Germany.

/...

49. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he could not remain silent about what had been said regarding his country by the representative of Australia in a very inappropriate context at the previous meeting. The people of the Ukrainian SSR, like those of socialist countries, enjoyed broad and democratic human rights and freedoms which were guaranteed and reliably ensured under the entire social system of socialist Soviet society. His delegation firmly rejected the slanderous fabrications and allusions of the Australian representative, who had brought up fables obviously derived from the so-called free bourgeois press and made a number of confused statements about what was allegedly lacking in soviet socialist society. He could assist the Australian representative in clearing up that confusion. In the Ukrainian SSR there were no capitalist landowners and no exploitation of man by man; there was no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and no hatred of any other people; and the right to propagate war, fascism or racism did not exist. There was no inequality or dissension among the peoples living in the Ukrainian SSR, no citizen was deprived of political rights or the possibility of participating in the management of the State; there was no unemployment and there were no class or occupational elites or privileged groups. All those phenomena abounded in the bourgeois society of Australia.

50. The representative of Australia had tried to divert the Committee's attention from the basic problems in his own country. Yet serious violations of human rights occurred in Australia, as was shown by, inter alia resolution 5 (XXXIII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which referred to the situation of the 150,000 aborigines in Australia who were deprived of their rights and victimized by racism: over half were unemployed and nearly two thirds lived in extreme poverty. Such facts showed the reality of human rights violations in Australia. Although Australia posed as a champion of human rights it had not ratified a number of international legal agreements and covenants in the field of human rights, including the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity and the Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Its attitude to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1 was significant, for the important problem of the fight against fascism was no less urgent than it had been before the rout of Hitlerite fascism. Yet the Australian delegation together with the delegations of other Western countries had done everything possible to oppose the adoption of that draft resolution. His delegation noted with satisfaction that despite the position of those countries the Committee had adopted a draft resolution drawing the attention of broad circles of the international community to the danger of the revival of the activities of nazism and neo-nazism which would thereby help strengthen the fight against totalitarian ideologies and fascist practices. Fascism was an ideology of the far right, which might explain why the representative of Australia and the representatives of other capitalist countries had tried to organize such a violent attack against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1.

51. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had been surprised at the reaction of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom to his statement, in

/...

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

which he had not even referred to them. Both of them had invoked insinuations and distortions of reality which were broadly disseminated by the Western propaganda machine; his delegation wholeheartedly rejected them as being completely unfounded. Those delegations should know that socialist democracy afforded a broad range of rights and freedoms to all people on a scale which the people of the imperialist countries could only dream about. The United Kingdom had once again tried to falsify history and had failed to do justice to the memory of the tens of thousands of British soldiers who had fought against the common enemy represented by Hitlerism, fascism and nazism; he would have offered a better tribute to them if he had supported draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1 rather than making offensive, unworthy and slanderous attacks against other countries. The United Kingdom representative should be aware that the aggression of Hitler Germany in the Second World War had been made possible by the policy of collusion of the United Kingdom Government of the day; the purpose of the Munich Agreement had been to send Hitler's aggressive forces against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had never been an ally of Hitler Germany and had staunchly defended its independence; throughout the 1930s it had suggested to the Western countries that they should establish a collective security system, yet instead the United Kingdom Government at that time had done everything possible to push the Fascist war machine into the Soviet Union.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that it was the sovereign right of each delegation to exercise the right of reply, but only in accordance with the rules of procedure and the provisions of the General Assembly, including General Assembly resolution 34/401. In accordance with the rule set forth in that resolution, he could not accord the right to any representative to make a right of reply whenever he wanted; he therefore resented the insinuations made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.