

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1710th  
MEETING**

Friday, 21 November 1969,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 55, 56 and 57:

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

- (a) Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (*continued*):

- (a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

Consideration of draft resolutions (*continued*) . . . . .

Page

347

sect. A; A/7660, A/7762, A/C.3/619, A/C.3/L.1659, A/C.3/L.1740, E/CN.4/950, E/CN.4/984 and Add.1-19):

- (a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
(*continued*)

1. Mr. BARTTFELD (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1739/Rev.1, which had been adopted at the previous meeting, because each party was blaming the other for the violations of human rights that were occurring constantly in the Middle East. His Government was concerned about the situation of the Arab refugees, but it was also concerned about the treatment of Jews in Arab countries. Argentina's population included half a million Jews and more than half a million Arabs, who were living in freedom and peace. The Constitution of Argentina, promulgated in 1853, guaranteed respect for human rights, particularly the right to freedom of movement. His delegation regretted that the conflict was creating a highly-charged atmosphere; and it had in the Security Council already stressed the need for compliance with the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

2. Mr. LORCH (Israel) said that he had voted against the draft resolution adopted at the preceding meeting because, as was clear from the list of sponsors, the text had been politically motivated and was completely one-sided, since it ignored the plight of Jews in Arab countries. The world had just learnt of the hanging of more innocent Jews in Baghdad on the previous day.

3. Moreover, the draft resolution that had been adopted condemned practices whose existence was unproved and had been denied by the authorities concerned. Even though the draft had been adopted only by a relatively small majority, its adoption might imperil human rights and encourage violations of human rights in Arab countries.

4. His Government would welcome any impartial investigation—such as that undertaken by the Gussing Mission—of any alleged violations. It would continue to ensure security in the occupied territories.

5. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that her delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because the text contained allegations which had not been proved and because operative paragraph 3 prejudged the results of the Special Committee's investigation. In her delegation's view, the

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH  
(Mauritania).

**AGENDA ITEMS 55, 56 AND 57**

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/7649 and Add.1, A/7667, A/7688, A/C.3/L.1733, A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1741):

- (a) Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7581/Rev.1, A/7603, chap. IX, sect. C; A/7683, A/C.3/617, A/C.3/618)

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (*continued*) (A/7603, chap. IX,

question of the violation of human rights should be considered in a broader context.

6. Mr. WILSON (Liberia) said that his country had always supported the principles of the Charter relating to human rights and would continue to oppose racial discrimination of all kinds. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the preamble and the operative part were both inconsistent with the title of the agenda item, which was: "Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms . . . in all countries . . .". The proposed text was incomplete because it did not take into consideration violations of human rights committed in countries other than the territories occupied by Israel.

7. Mr. JOSHI (Nepal) said that, at the last session, his delegation had voted for General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) for humanitarian reasons, despite the fact that the preamble had tended to prejudge the guilt of the Government of Israel. The operative part, on the other hand, merely provided for the establishment of a committee of investigation. Since his delegation felt that the occupying Power should comply with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it had favoured the establishment of a special committee of investigation and regretted that the Committee had only recently been established and had not yet been able to carry out its task.

8. On the other hand, the operative part of the draft adopted at the 1709th meeting contained new and extremely serious charges which had not been authenticated by any impartial observer and had been vehemently denied by the Government of Israel. The normal procedure would have been for the Assembly to refrain from taking a decision until it had received a report from the Special Committee, which would otherwise have no reason for existing. His delegation had therefore, in spite of its deep humanitarian concern, abstained on the draft resolution.

9. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that her delegation had voted for the draft resolution mainly for humanitarian reasons and quite irrespective of any political considerations. Greece considered that Israel should comply with the Geneva Conventions, particularly the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which was specifically referred to in the resolution. Israel, as the victor in the six-day war, could be expected to be more generous, and the sufferings that the people of Israel had endured in the Second World War should make them determined to prevent any repetition of the same atrocities. She expressed the hope that better days would come for all the inhabitants of the Middle East.

10. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) expressed his regret that no member of his delegation had been present at the time of the vote at the preceding meeting. Burundi, true to the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter and in the Geneva Conventions of 1949 would have voted for the resolution without reservation, and it would certainly do so in the General Assembly.

11. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because of its one-sidedness. Under Article 24 of the United Nations Charter,

the Security Council was primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security; and it was therefore for the Security Council to investigate the situation. In the present instance, the facts had not yet been established, and the resolution that had been adopted was premature and unjustified.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution circulated in document A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 and the amendments to the draft resolution proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1741), together with the statement of the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.1733) on the financial implications of various suggestions contained in document A/7649.

13. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom), introducing his delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1741) to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, said that the purpose of the second amendment was to change the name of the proposed International Year. In his view, instead of speaking of "combating" or "repressing" certain phenomena, it would be better to stress the positive aspect of the action to be taken. The United Kingdom had promulgated legislation against racial discrimination and, with a view to eliminating discrimination and misunderstandings, had set up national and local committees containing representatives of different races. Misunderstandings were inevitable when persons with different ways of life, different education or even different vocabularies came into contact.

14. The purpose of the first and third amendments was to delete the word "neo-nazism". Whatever the nature of the recent developments in the Federal Republic of Germany, his delegation thought it was wrong to refer to violations of human rights in some regions and not in others. Moreover, he did not believe that there was any reason for concern about a resurgence of nazism in the Federal Republic of Germany.

15. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the hope that the representative of the United Kingdom would confine himself to introducing his amendments and would not reopen the general debate.

16. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) felt that the term "neo-nazism" was not sufficiently specific and could be applied to different phenomena. The case of South Africa, where any doctrine unacceptable to the Government was described as communism, was very significant in that respect. He wondered whether the sponsors of the draft resolution were using the term "neo-nazism" to refer solely to the phenomenon noted in the Federal Republic of Germany. He recalled that the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, had himself said he was extremely satisfied with the results of the recent elections in that country, where the vast majority of the electorate had rejected the National Democratic Party (NPD).

17. If neo-nazism was to be combated within the framework of criminal law, it must be very precisely defined. Furthermore, condemning the followers of any doctrine almost invariably had the effect of making martyrs of them and of enabling that doctrine to gain much greater

importance than it would have if it had not been banned. The benefits of free discussion had been demonstrated by the recent elections in the Federal Republic of Germany.

18. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2.

19. With regard to the United Kingdom amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 (A/C.3/L.1741, paras. 1 and 3), he observed that his delegation was not an authority on the question of nazism and neo-nazism, which were purely European phenomena, but was basically concerned with racial discrimination in the countries in southern Africa. He did, however, wish to emphasize the role played by nazism in the introduction of the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. The change in the title of the proposed international year suggested by the United Kingdom (*ibid.*, para. 2) would bring out the positive aspect of the matter, but the negative aspect, which was equally important, should not be overlooked, for action to combat racism and racial discrimination afforded the only means of promoting racial harmony.

20. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she was wholeheartedly in favour of the celebration of an International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and that her country intended to take part in all activities designed to eliminate racial discrimination. She supported the United Kingdom amendment calling for the deletion of the word "neo-nazism" because she, like the Tanzanian representative, thought that the emphasis should be placed on the struggle against *apartheid*. Also, she feared, as did the United Kingdom representative, that the term "neo-nazism" might be used by certain delegations as a political weapon against the Federal Republic of Germany. She favoured the positive approach reflected in the second United Kingdom amendment but would like to know the opinion of other delegations in that regard.

21. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 as a whole and the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1741). However, she had certain reservations regarding the financial implications of the various proposals set forth in document A/7649. The estimate of expenditure in document A/C.3/L.1733 seemed to her to be much too high considering that the United Nations had just celebrated an International Year for Human Rights and was contemplating the celebration of a whole series of other international years. In particular, she had reservations concerning the staff estimates in paragraph 8 of document A/C.3/L.1733. She thought that those costs could be reduced, since the implementation of the programme would be primarily the responsibility of Governments. Consequently, her delegation would not be in a position to support the budget estimates as they stood and would have to request the Secretariat to review them.

22. Mr. RESICH (Poland) said that the United Kingdom amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph and to operative paragraph 4 reflected a tendency to minimize the danger inherent in the rebirth of nazism in the Federal Republic of Germany and the African countries. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 was not directed

against the German people but, on the contrary, was designed to protect them from a rebirth of nazism. In the Federal Republic of Germany there were neo-Nazi groups and organizations which pursued a racist and revanchist policy and whose members included a great number of criminals who had collaborated with the nazi régime. Mr. Santa Cruz' interim report on racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres indicated that "the NPD works closely with all kinds of organizations, associations and regional political (exile) groups of an unmistakably military nature" and with "arch-reactionary parties and groups that are variations of nazism".<sup>1</sup> The United Nations should therefore help the healthy forces within the Federal Republic of Germany to overcome the Nazi elements. By adopting resolutions condemning nazism and other international instruments such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, the United Nations had already made a contribution to the elimination of nazism, as could be seen from the results of the recent elections in the Federal Republic of Germany, which had marked the defeat of the National Democratic Party. However, the danger inherent in a rebirth of nazism not only affected the Federal Republic of Germany and Europe but was a threat to the whole world. In introducing his report (E/CN.4/950), the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts established in pursuance of resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights had rightly stressed the influence of Nazi ideology on the policy of *apartheid*. Neo-nazism was the form which nazism was taking in the present-day world.

23. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) categorically rejected the United Kingdom representative's allegation that the term "neo-nazism" would be used by certain delegations to attack a country which was not a Member of the United Nations. The Soviet Union maintained normal diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and was endeavouring to expand them. The United Kingdom's accusation, therefore, was simply an attempt to poison relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.

24. The world still remembered the crimes committed in the name of nazism. That ideology, however, had not disappeared with the last war; it was continuing to manifest itself in the form of neo-nazism. Furthermore, the term "neo-nazism" had already appeared in United Nations resolutions; the Commission on Human Rights had used it several times to describe the new form taken by nazism in the present-day world and the Conference of Teheran, in resolution II, "*Strongly condemns nazism, neo-nazism, racism and all similar ideologies and practices based on terrorism and racial intolerance*".<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it could not be said that nazism was a purely European phenomenon, any more than it could be said that *apartheid* was a purely African question. Nazism, like *apartheid*, concerned all human beings and mankind should strive to eliminate both. The whole world had been affected by nazism and the

<sup>1</sup> See document E/CN.4/Sub.2/301, para. 729.

<sup>2</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), pp. 5-6.

Second World War. The existence of Nazi and neo-Nazi groups at the present time was a fact, and those groups should be banned. He therefore could not accept the deletion of the word "neo-nazism" from the draft resolution. He was likewise unable to support the second United Kingdom amendment proposing that the words "Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination" should be replaced by the words "the Promotion of Racial Harmony". For many years the United Nations had been combating racism and it had adopted an International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had entered into force in January 1969. Were the criminals and their victims now to be reconciled? It seemed to him that, on the contrary, the United Nations should direct all its efforts towards action to combat such scourges of mankind as racism and racial discrimination.

25. With regard to the financial implications of the programme suggested by the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.1733), he agreed with the representative of the United States that the Secretariat had over-estimated the amounts required for its implementation. The Secretariat should be able to co-ordinate the activities undertaken by States without requiring additional staff for that purpose.

26. Mr. BASELE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) proposed that the last part of the fourth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, beginning with the words "including the policy of *apartheid*", should be replaced by the words "in all its forms". The amendment would stress the universality and the preventive value of action to combat racism.

27. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that, essentially, an international year provided an opportunity to draw public attention to certain ideas and to encourage Governments to ratify conventions and, when necessary, to adopt measures for their implementation. Consequently, the programmes for the celebration of such years should be as flexible as possible so that they could be adapted in the light of the problems existing in each country. In that connexion, her delegation supported the programme suggested by the Secretary-General (A/7649) and her Government would choose from that programme the activities which were most suitable for Jamaica. At the international level, it would be appropriate on the one hand to adopt agreed measures designed to combat the racist policy pursued by certain States and, on the other hand, to help certain other countries, whose policies were not racist but which had to contend with manifestations of racism among their populations, to eliminate all forms of racism and maintain good relations between the different racial groups. Furthermore, as had been suggested by Guyana, both in national and international programmes emphasis should be placed on the younger generation, which was the best ally in the struggle to overcome racial discrimination.

28. She supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 and wished only to suggest some stylistic improvements. For example, in the second preambular paragraph the words "of the Charter" should be inserted after the word "principles". In the English text of the draft resolution, the word "level" in the fourth preambular

paragraph and operative paragraph 4 should be replaced by the word "levels". Lastly, she suggested that the word "concerned" should be added after the words "specialized agencies" in operative paragraph 5.

29. With regard to the title of the international year proposed for 1971, she thought it should be sufficiently short to enable it to be used as a slogan, and she suggested that it should be called "International Year for Racial Justice". Her delegation associated itself with those which regretted the use of the word "neo-nazism", the meaning of which was too vague. The suggestion by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo that the enumeration of the forms of racial discrimination should be omitted would unfortunately also eliminate any mention of *apartheid* from the text. Perhaps the problem could be minimized, if not solved, by replacing the word "neo-nazism" by the words "and its contemporary forms".

30. Mr. PAOLINI (France) supported the idea of celebrating 1971 as an International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and was therefore in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2. However, the estimate of financial implications seemed to him somewhat excessive and his delegation wondered whether the Secretariat could not put out a revised text taking into consideration the remarks made by several delegations.

31. He appreciated the suggestions made by the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Jamaica. With regard to the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom, his delegation too felt that the term "neo-nazism" was too vague and might cause confusion. For certain people it would automatically have a specific political connotation, and in that connexion he wished to refute the accusations levelled against the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Committee. Furthermore, the term "neo-nazism" was too restricted and did not cover all the contemporary movements which, while not claiming kinship with nazism, were nevertheless totalitarian and racist. If, however, the word "neo-nazism" was omitted, as proposed by the United Kingdom, the result would be a text which, in 1969, would simply call for the elimination of the nazism which had disappeared twenty years earlier.

32. On behalf of the French and the Indian delegations, he proposed a sub-amendment which would replace the word "neo-nazism" in the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 by the words "and all of its contemporary forms". With regard to the second United Kingdom amendment, his delegation saw no reason why the title proposed by the United Kingdom should not be added to the original title. However, it seemed likely that the Jamaican proposal would receive the largest number of votes.

33. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) noted with satisfaction that the programme put forward by the Secretary-General seemed to have won a very large measure of approval among the members of the Committee.

34. With regard to the financial implications (A/C.3/L.1733) of the suggestions in document A/7649, which

certain representatives had found excessive, he would like to point out that, if the Committee approved the programme, it would also have to approve its consequences and in particular its financial implications. Document A/C.3/L.1733 estimated the total cost of all the proposals, and it would then be for the budgetary and financial organs of the United Nations to examine them and break down the costs under their separate headings.

35. The costs referred to in paragraph 2 of document A/C.3/L.1733 could be financed from within available resources, provided the documentation did not exceed a certain volume. Similarly, the costs of the seminar referred to in paragraph 3 could be included in the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights if the Government of a Member State offered to act as host. On the other hand, the publication of a special pamphlet on the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, mentioned in paragraph 4, would inevitably entail certain costs. The activities mentioned in paragraph 5 could probably be financed from within available resources. The travel costs indicated in paragraph 6 were actually considerably lower than those which had been provided for in the case of the International Year for Human Rights. With regard to the additional staff resources required to carry out the programme, as shown in paragraph 8, the posts provided for were already included in the budget estimates for 1970 which were now being discussed by the Fifth Committee. As had been shown by past experience with similar activities, the role of the Secretary-General would include considerable promotion and liaison work. The posts for which provision had been made for 1971 and 1972 were actually less numerous than those requested for

the International Year for Human Rights, and the Division of Human Rights would study the possibility of reducing the staff estimates for 1971 and 1972. It would, of course, seek the help of Governments and voluntary organizations.

36. He thought there was no need to submit a new estimate of the financial implications, which had been worked out with the greatest possible emphasis on economy. If the Committee felt that the cost of certain proposals was too high, it would have to change the programme itself.

37. Mr. BABAA (Libya), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had been shocked to hear the United States representative describe some of the discussions on violations of human rights in the occupied Arab territories as anti-Semitic. The fact was that the discussion had at no time been inspired by racial or religious considerations, and the anxiety expressed over the fate of the population of the occupied territories was entirely legitimate. In any case, the United States delegation had not opposed the resolution, a fact which clearly indicated that the United States Government was aware of the violations of human rights being perpetrated by Israel in the Middle East. It seemed that the representative of the United States made no distinction between Zionism and Judaism, whereas many Jewish organizations were themselves opposed to Zionism. In that connexion, he quoted a letter which he had received from an American Jew showing that Zionism and Judaism were mutually contradictory. It was therefore clearly not possible to denounce as anti-Semitic those who protested against Zionism.

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*