

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1699th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 11 November 1969,
at 10.55 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

General debate (*continued*)

Page

261

countries and territories (*continued*) (A/7603, chap. IX, sect. A; A/7660, A/C.3/L.1659, 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

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. WATANABE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), speaking at the Chairman's invitation, said that the continuation of any form of racial discrimination contravened the Constitution of UNESCO, which had always actively promoted the cause of racial equality. From 1950 onwards, the General Conference of UNESCO had adopted resolutions stressing the need to initiate intensive campaigns in order to provide a greater volume of information on the action taken to resolve racial problems and defining that organization's tasks with respect to the elimination of colonialism and racialism. In implementing those resolutions, and in compliance with the various United Nations declarations and decisions, UNESCO had not only stimulated and helped national press, radio, television and film organizations to disseminate information concerning racial problems, including the policy of *apartheid*, but had also issued various publications on different aspects of the topic and was preparing others. On the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, celebrated on 21 March 1969, UNESCO had distributed large quantities of a special issue of its monthly publication, the UNESCO *Courier*, dealing with the elimination of racial discrimination, and also a booklet on the effects of *apartheid* on education, science and culture in South Africa.

2. Moreover, the International Centre for Higher Education in Journalism of the University of Strasbourg had organized a meeting in January 1969, with the aid of UNESCO, to study the role of the press in combating racial prejudice and racial discrimination. Also, UNESCO was to hold in December 1969 a meeting of experts on the role of mass media in multiracial societies, which was to assess the influence of the media on the formation of attitudes and behavioural patterns in the field of race prejudice and discrimination. In addition, the following studies were under preparation: a comparative analysis of the trend of ethnic group relations in selected African countries; an assessment of the role of education in the elimination of racial discrimination and prejudice; and an examination of the role which could be played by mass media in the

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Sipilä (Finland),
Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEMS 55, 56 AND 57

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/7649 and Add.1, A/7667, A/7688):

- (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)

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

formulation of favourable and unfavourable attitudes towards ethnic groups.

3. He would also mention the UNESCO Convention and Recommendation against Discrimination in Education, adopted by the General Conference in 1960, one of the aims of which was the eradication of racial discrimination in education. Up to the present, fifty-two States members of UNESCO had deposited instruments of ratification or acceptance of the Convention, and some had submitted reports on its implementation. On the basis of those reports, the General Conference had, in 1968, recommended the establishment of closer links between the agency's general activities in the field of education and the implementation of the Convention and Recommendation, and had appealed to all the member States to intensify their efforts to eliminate discrimination in education.

4. The education of youth in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was thus an essential part of the efforts made by UNESCO in the field of human rights and in the struggle against racial discrimination. Such discrimination was not rejected instinctively, and it was necessary to inculcate in every individual respect for human equality as a truth for which he must constantly be ready to account; in short, recognition of the equality of all men was a subject which had to be taught. That was why the UNESCO General Conference had been urging since 1948 that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be incorporated in all teaching programmes and that the principles it enshrined should be disseminated as widely as possible. The great majority of young people were ready to take action to obtain and strengthen justice for themselves and for others. Through the teaching of human rights to youth, that firm attitude could be enlisted in the effort to abolish all forms of racial prejudice and discrimination.

5. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) recalled that although the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1968 had served to emphasize the important progress achieved in implementing the standards and principles of human rights, it had been recognized on the same occasion that there was no reason for complacency. The adoption of international instruments was certainly an important first step towards promoting respect for human rights; nevertheless the second stage, that of implementation, without which the value of those instruments would be very limited, was of far greater importance.

6. On the basis of the Universal Declaration, a whole network of international instruments concerning human rights had been established, centred on the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and on the two International Covenants on Human Rights. In that connexion the Member States which had ratified those instruments were to be congratulated, in particular Costa Rica and Ecuador, the two countries which had accepted the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, thus setting an example which deserved to be followed. He hoped that the Government of Norway would be able to deposit its ratification of the three instruments in the near future, when the study of the relevant national legislation had been completed and all the necessary legislative measures had

been enacted, in accordance with the provisions of that country's Constitution.

7. During the past few years there had clearly been a significant increase in the application of human rights concepts in legal argument and political debate, both at the international level and within each national community. That practical recognition of the importance of human rights was at least in part to be attributed to the information activities which had been carried out for many years and which had recently been intensified on the occasion of the International Year for Human Rights; those activities had promoted respect for human rights throughout the world. It was obvious that the degree in which the principles of human rights were respected would basically depend on the extent to which the public in general, and the legislators in particular, knew about them. To that end, more attention should be paid to the information activities being undertaken in that field by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, by regional governmental organizations, and also by non-governmental organizations which had made such a valuable contribution in the matter.

8. Therefore it was of interest to note the way in which the concept of human rights had been broadened. As a reflection of the needs and aspirations of the vast human groups which were striving to achieve a better life, there was a continually growing recognition, at the national and international level, of the social, economic and cultural rights which constituted an integral part of human rights. Nevertheless it had to be admitted that in many cases the expressions of those rights represented goals which society had undertaken to achieve, rather than compulsory standards, and that there was at present no comprehensive machinery designed to ensure for every person a definite level of material well-being, although perhaps procedures to that effect might be established at some future date.

9. With regard to the implementation of civil and political human rights, he wished to refer to the procedure adopted ten years earlier by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 728 F (XXVIII) for dealing with communications concerning human rights. At its twenty-fifth session, the Commission on Human Rights had proposed the adoption of a new and better procedure, in accordance with which such communications would be transmitted through the Secretary-General to a special working group of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which would determine whether they revealed a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights.¹ True, it might be argued that the mandate of the proposed working group would to a certain extent imply the exercise of executive and judicial powers which were normally the prerogative of States. However, the Norwegian Government believed that no violation of sovereignty would be involved, since, as was provided for in the proposal, an investigation could be initiated only if the State concerned agreed. The voluntary transfer of executive, judicial or even legislative powers by States to international bodies had become common practice and should be regarded as an expression and application, rather than a limitation, of national sovereignty. Since the

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-sixth Session*, document E/4621, paras. 409-435.

Commission on Human Rights could not perform its functions effectively unless it was provided with the necessary procedures and machinery for a proper consideration of allegations of violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the Norwegian Government hoped that the proposed new procedure, which was a significant improvement on the one currently in use, would be adopted and applied within the next few years.

10. There was an urgent need to provide people who felt that their rights had been curtailed or violated with a means of transmitting their complaints to the national and international organs responsible for the observance of human rights. Accordingly, the people and Government of Norway had noted with concern that the Secretary-General had felt obliged to instruct the information offices not to receive and transmit any communications of that nature addressed to the United Nations. Even where such channels of communication were available in principle, some minority groups were not in a position to make use of them, because they lived in isolation from organized society, for ethnic, cultural or linguistic reasons. In view of the difficulties involved in integrating such groups into society without causing them hardship, it was imperative that Governments having such groups within their territorial jurisdiction take all necessary steps to protect them against violations of human rights. Wherever they lived, whatever their race, language or religion, and whatever the reasons for their present situation, minorities were entitled to respect and protection in accordance with the principles of fundamental human rights. The world community could not tolerate arbitrary abuse of those peoples' right to self-respect and dignity, to live and work in peace, and to contribute to and benefit from world progress.

11. Every conflict throughout history had produced innocent victims, and the conflicts of modern times were no exception. Nevertheless, the general principles of fundamental human rights, as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and other international instruments, applied fully during armed conflicts and with equal force to all victims of hostilities: the innocent civilian populations which suffered in wars and disasters, prisoners of war, persons who were interned, detained or imprisoned for political or other reasons, and those who had been displaced from their homelands because of armed conflicts. The plight of refugees from strife-torn areas was particularly harrowing, because they lived demoralizing and humiliating lives of enforced idleness in camps, waiting in vain for a return to normal life. Indeed, developments in the past two decades indicated the need for further international instruments to protect victims of hostilities in all armed conflicts. Nevertheless, until such instruments were in effect, it was essential that the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims² should be fully implemented and observed, a course which would help considerably to reduce the horrors of war.

12. One of the saddest and most shameful social phenomena of the modern era was the persistence of racial discrimination. Thus, in civil, political, economic, social and

cultural activities, there was discrimination against individuals, not because of what they had done or had failed to do, but because of the colour of their skin. Although it might be said that no one was sufficiently free of prejudice to set himself up as a judge of his fellow-men in that respect, it was incumbent upon everyone to protest when a country made racism a Government policy and a way of life for its citizens, in flagrant defiance of fundamental human ideas and in clear violation of the principles on which all international co-operation was based.

13. According to the report submitted to the General Assembly by the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa,³ the situation created by that policy was steadily becoming more dangerous, while the world community was being frustrated in its desire to alleviate the plight of millions of people who were deprived of fundamental human rights and experienced increasing hardships under *apartheid*. In that atmosphere of increasing frustration, the Norwegian Government had been deeply impressed by the reaffirmation of human values and rights contained in the Manifesto on southern Africa⁴ adopted by the sixth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in Addis Ababa in September 1969. That important document contained an appeal to reason based on the fundamental recognition of the fact that all men were created equal and had equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of colour, race, religion and sex, and to participate, as equal members of society, in their own government. As an alternative to the hatred, violence and cruel repression inherent in any policy based on a belief in the superiority of one race over another, the Manifesto pointed to co-operation between men as a solution. The Norwegian Government hoped that that new approach to the problems of southern Africa would provide a basis for serious attempts to find solutions before it was too late.

14. Man's inhumanity to man had darkened the whole history of mankind; therefore, the most real and profound progress was demonstrated in the increasing condemnation of such inhumanity. One of the most encouraging features of the United Nations was the increasing emphasis which it placed on human rights. In view of the development of international relations in recent times, gross violations of human rights could no longer be said to fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of States. If world order and world organizations were to have any meaning at all, it must be realized that the suffering and humiliation of human beings everywhere were the concern of all mankind. The protection of human rights therefore required a determined effort by everyone, since there was a long way to go before the noble principles embodied in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations twenty-five years earlier were translated into reality.

Mrs. Turkia Ould Daddah (Mauritania) took the Chair.

15. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that the root cause of the problems connected with human rights were the

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), Nos. 970 to 973.

persistence of oppression and colonialism, and racial prejudice and discrimination in the political, social, economic, cultural and other spheres. Any reference to violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms immediately brought to mind the situation existing in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, the African Territories under Portuguese domination, Viet-Nam and the Middle East. From the outset the United Nations had striven to eliminate the various forms of racial discrimination and, in particular, the most drastic of all—the policy of *apartheid*. However, those efforts, which included the adoption of numerous instruments and recommendations, had not had the desired effect, and racial discrimination continued to be a sad reality of the modern world.

16. In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in the Proclamation of Teheran⁵ and in countless United Nations resolutions, it had been repeatedly stated that all human beings were free and equal, and that there should be no distinction of any kind between them. The policy of *apartheid* had also been condemned, since it constituted a threat to international peace and security, and the urgent need to use every possible means to eliminate it had been stressed. The effective implementation of those instruments should be the yardstick for measuring the willingness of each country to contribute towards the achievement of such a noble ideal. Moreover, it was incumbent upon the United Nations and its organs to identify and unmask the advocates of discriminatory policies, whether they were States, organizations or individuals, so that they might be exposed to public condemnation.

17. On a number of occasions her delegation had spoken of the reasons why South Africa was able to challenge the international community with impunity. Among them were the political and military assistance it was receiving and the constant improvement of its economic relations with some industrialized Western nations. So long as those nations continued to be content with oral condemnations of the illegal acts of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal, without doing anything to translate them into practical action, those régimes would continue to be encouraged to follow their dangerous course. As a result of that situation, racism had become one of the basic causes of instability in Africa and an ever-increasing threat to world peace.

18. At the present session, as on previous occasions, the Committee had before it voluminous material on violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the policies of racial discrimination and segregation and *apartheid*, but there was no sign of any progress in that field. The inhuman practices of *apartheid* were continuing with unabated fury; the repression and arrogance of the white racists were increasing, and the United Nations had thus far failed to implement its decisions, primarily because of the attitude of the régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal and of South Africa's major trading partners.

19. Her delegation was ready to continue to exert efforts in all organs of the United Nations, with a view to bringing

about the adoption of effective measures to put an end to the constant violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms; it expressed its appreciation to the Commission on Human Rights and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission for their valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations in that sphere.

20. Yugoslavia had been among the first countries to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; her delegation was particularly pleased that that important instrument had come into force and was sure that it would help in the struggle against racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations. It wished to stress, however, that *apartheid*, the most obvious racial policy practised at present, went unpunished because of the lack of real co-operation on the part of those who could exercise their influence on the practitioners of that discriminatory policy.

21. The programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, proposed by the Secretary-General in document A/7649, abounded in ideas; she urged that priority should be given to those which would actually lead to a more rapid eradication of the causes of racial discrimination.

22. Her delegation wholeheartedly supported all the activities of the United Nations and its organs aimed at combating racism, an ideology which was based on terror and racial intolerance and therefore ran counter to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The revival of nazism would result in a mass violation of human rights, endanger the security of peoples and jeopardize world peace. For that reason, Yugoslavia, which had been a victim of the "master race" theory and had experienced the full horror of Hitler's nazism and Mussolini's fascism, favoured the immediate adoption of effective measures to prevent a revival of that heinous ideology. The elimination of all forms of racial discrimination was closely related to the need to outlaw all Fascist organizations based on racial prejudice or the concept of racial superiority. It was not enough to denounce any attempts to establish organizations and political parties based on Fascist ideology; if there was to be no repetition of the heinous crimes committed in the name of that doctrine it was essential that legal and administrative measures should be adopted in the countries concerned to prevent the revival of such groups.

23. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said that, of the three items before the Committee, the question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms was singularly important. While her delegation continued to deplore the inhumane practice of *apartheid* in South Africa and Namibia, it felt that, since that question was dealt with in many other United Nations bodies, the Committee should not devote all its time to it, lest in so doing it neglected the many instances of grave violations of human rights elsewhere in the world. For example, it was clear from press dispatches and other sources of information that the right to dissent with their country's political system was still denied to millions of persons. Prisons were filled with individuals who had dared to criticize their Governments' policies or to protest against them by peaceful means, and

⁵ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 3.

many of those prisoners were brutally mistreated, in contravention of all standards of human dignity. The evidence gathered in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa (E/CN.4/950) was relevant in that regard.

24. Her delegation was also deeply disturbed by the fundamental violation of human rights in respect of another category of persons, namely, prisoners of war protected by international law, such as the members of the United States armed forces captured in Viet-Nam.

25. The Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the treatment of prisoners of war applied to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which might arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war was not recognized by one of them. The Convention, which the United States had ratified in 1955 and to which the Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded in 1953, and North Viet-Nam in 1957, assured prisoners the right to remain in communication with their families and with international or State organizations which had assumed the obligation of safeguarding the rights of prisoners. In addition to that right of communication, the Convention specified the minimum humane standards of detention, hygiene, diet, recreation and labour. Thus it was meant to ensure minimum standards of human decency to helpless men who were in the power of their enemy and could no longer pose a threat to that enemy and to provide minimum solace to families who were far from the front lines.

26. The United States placed the highest priority on the implementation of that Convention. There were at present some 30,000 North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong prisoners of war who had been accorded the status and the rights of prisoners of war under the Convention, even though many of them might not be technically entitled to such status as defined in the Convention. The United States had tried again and again, in vain, to persuade Hanoi to apply the basic minimum standards guaranteed by the Convention. In contrast, the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, with the co-operation of its allies, had opened all detention camps to inspection by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The names of those prisoners had been made available to the Committee and they had the right to send and receive mail. They were interned in six camps, which were administered by the Republic of Viet-Nam and which, as regular international inspection had shown, conformed to the requirements of the Geneva Convention.

27. The allied command had made every effort to ensure that the Convention was applied: for example, it issued clear and explicit orders, thoroughly investigated alleged violations and punished those found guilty. In contrast, the North Viet-Nameese authorities had refused to identify the prisoners they held. Only a limited minority of those men known by the United States Government to have been captured had been allowed to communicate with the outside world, and mail from them had been infrequent and irregular. The sick and the wounded had not been repatriated or identified. Even the minimum protection that would be afforded by inspection of prisoner-of-war facilities by an impartial international body had been denied. The requests of the International Committee of the Red Cross and other recognized intermediaries to be allowed to

visit the prisoners at their places of detention had been repeatedly denied. There was also evidence that prisoners were deprived of adequate medical care and diets and that in many instances they had been subjected to physical and mental torture.

28. Hanoi's position had been to allege that the Geneva Convention did not apply because there had been no formal declaration of war, which meant that United States prisoners were "war criminals" and therefore not entitled to the rights conferred by the Geneva Convention. Hanoi affirmed that it treated the prisoners humanely, but that assertion had never been verified by impartial inspection and was no substitute for application of the Convention. Moreover, Hanoi's assertion that the Convention was inapplicable and could not be taken as the standard by which to measure its conduct had no basis in international law. Hanoi argued that the Convention applied only when there had been a declaration of war, but it was clear from the language of the Convention that the absence of such a declaration had no relation to the Convention's applicability and did not justify a refusal to apply it. Moreover, the Geneva Convention and modern international humanitarian law rejected any suggestion that the protection of individual war victims, whether soldiers or civilians, was dependent upon moral or legal judgements on the cause for which their Governments were fighting. The law existed to protect all the victims of war on both sides. The Geneva Convention imposed upon all combatant Powers the obligation to treat military personnel made helpless by their captivity in accordance with a single objective and verifiable standard.

29. The Twenty-first International Conference of the Red Cross, held at Istanbul in September 1969, had adopted a resolution calling upon all parties to abide by the obligations set forth in the Convention and upon all authorities involved in an armed conflict to ensure that all uniformed members of the regular armed forces of another party to the conflict and all other persons entitled to prisoner-of-war status should be treated humanely and given the fullest measure of protection prescribed by the Convention. The resolution also recognized that, even apart from the Convention, the international community had consistently demanded humane treatment for prisoners of war, including identification and accounting for all prisoners, provision of an adequate diet and medical care, that the prisoners should be permitted to communicate with each other and with the exterior, that seriously sick or wounded prisoners should be promptly repatriated, and that at all times prisoners should be protected from physical and mental torture, abuse and reprisals. Her delegation hoped that North Viet-Nam would heed that unequivocal and specific call, which reflected the conscience of the international community.

30. On 30 August 1969 the Secretary-General had stated that in his view the Government of North Viet-Nam ought to give an international humanitarian organization such as the League of Red Cross Societies access to the Americans detained in North Viet-Nam. Her delegation shared that view and urged the Governments represented on the Committee to use their utmost influence to ensure that that step at least could be accomplished, for it would bring closer the day when the observance of the humanitarian

principles of the Geneva Convention by all parties was complete.

31. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in his opinion the question brought up by the United States representative had no relation to the issues before the Committee. That question was a consequence and a manifestation of United States aggression in Viet-Nam, which constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. The attempt to open a debate on that problem was nothing but a trick to divert the Committee's attention from other matters, such as the violation of human rights by Israel in the Middle East. The United Nations was not competent to deal with the question of Viet-Nam; the only solution to that problem was for the United States to cease its aggression forthwith and observe the ten points set forth on 8 May 1969 by the National Liberation Front and the People's Revolutionary Government which were fully consonant with the Geneva Convention to which reference had been made.

32. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon), referring to the questions of racial discrimination and the violation of human rights, quoted a statement by the Hon. Anthony Nutting, former United Kingdom Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 2 November 1967, to the effect that *apartheid*, whether practised in South Africa against the Bantu or in Israel against the Arabs, was as repugnant as it was ultimately impractical. He also recalled how on 29 November 1967 the Israel newspaper *Maariv* had published an editorial stating that if Israel wished to avoid becoming another South Africa or Southern Rhodesia and imposing the rule of a minority on a suppressed majority, it had no alternative but to return to its previous borders. Since 1967, however, Israel had not only consolidated its position in the occupied territories but had even annexed parts of them, in defiance of United Nations resolutions. In addition, it had inflicted upon the civilian population of those territories inhuman acts, in violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Those acts were a cynical reminder of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in the occupied territories of Europe during the Second World War. All those acts were substantiated by the press of several countries. He quoted articles from *The Guardian* of 25 January 1968 and *Le Monde* of 12 March 1968, describing acts of persecution committed by the Israel authorities in the occupied territories.

33. Moreover, in violation of article 54 of the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, and article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Israel had confiscated Arab property and land, as reported in a Reuters dispatch of 11 August 1968 to the effect that the inhabitants of three Arab villages on the west bank of the Jordan had sent a protest note to the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the destruction of their villages and the confiscation of the land where their homes had stood.

34. In addition, Israel, in violation of article 49 of that Convention and article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had forcibly deported, evicted and transferred Arab inhabitants from their homes, as could be seen from a report published in *The Observer* on 24 December

1967 alleging that a quarter of a million Palestinian Arabs, including former refugees, had been expelled from the west bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. In violation of articles 33 and 35 of the Convention, Israel had destroyed Arab property and homes, and since June 1967 its army had been bulldozing Arab homes in an attempt to speed up the rate of eviction of the inhabitants of the occupied territories.

35. The United Nations had been considering the question of Israel's violation of human rights since 1967. The Security Council, the General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights and the International Conference on Human Rights had urged Israel to guarantee the security and protection of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations were taking place, not to destroy the homes of Arab civilians and to respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. Israel had not only ignored those appeals, but had systematically refused to permit any impartial investigation of violations of human rights in the occupied territories. It had refused to admit the special representative of the Secretary-General and the two United Nations Committees set up for the specific purpose of investigating those violations.

36. The Third Committee, which dealt with humanitarian questions, should condemn in the strongest terms the violations of the Geneva Conventions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by Israel and South Africa, and should urge the respective authorities to abide by international law and to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms.

37. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho) said that he wished to reaffirm his Government's agreement with all the basic principles expressed in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and in the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. All the fundamental principles of human rights—the right to life, the right to personal liberty, to freedom of movement and residence, freedom from inhuman treatment, freedom from forced labour and slavery, freedom of conscience and expression, freedom from discrimination, and equality before the law—were embodied in the Lesotho Constitution.

38. The Declaration and the International Convention had a deep and practical meaning for the Basotho, for they not only knew of what was happening in the minority-controlled areas where racism and racial discrimination were being practised but could see clearly what would certainly happen if the present trends were left unchecked. As human beings, the Basotho were conscious of their responsibility for helping the victims of racism and alleviating their suffering. The delegation of Lesotho particularly regretted the extreme and brutal manifestations of racial discrimination in some parts of the world, since racial discrimination harmed not only its victims but also those who practised it. So long as racist policies and acts persisted, there could not be justice or peace in the world.

39. With regard to nazism and racial intolerance, Lesotho was doing all in its power to inculcate in its young people a belief in the principles and purposes of the United Nations

Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, so as to protect them from nazism and other similar ideologies.

40. Lastly, his delegation noted with appreciation that the General Assembly, in resolution 2446 (XXII), had asked the Secretary-General to prepare a programme for the celebration in 1971 of an International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, an initiative which Lesotho firmly supported.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that some items were receiving more attention than others and that the United Nations television service apparently operated only when the great Powers were talking. That kind of preferential treatment was inadmissible, especially in the Third Committee, which had been dealing with discrimination for so many years. The principle of the sovereign equality of States was not a myth; all were entitled to the same treatment and the same amount of publicity. He had been told that the television team at present in the Committee room belonged to the United Nations Office of Public Information, yet it was quite evident that it was being operated at the request of one country, or even under the orders of that country. He therefore wished to know who had asked for the present meeting to be televised, and if the television coverage would continue, as would be logical, until the discussion of the items at present under consideration was concluded.

42. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), referring to the remarks of the representative of Saudi Arabia, said that it was customary for the United Nations to allow outside information media to ask permission to film, photograph or televise all or part of a public meeting of a United Nations body, for publicity purposes. In such cases, the United Nations allowed the accredited media to bring their own television or cinematographic equipment, or to hire that of the United Nations, provided that they paid for the services rendered. He assured the Saudi Arabian representative that that procedure had been followed in the present instance.

43. With regard to the second question, he was not aware that anyone had asked for the whole debate on the items at

present under consideration to be televised, but if such a request were made he would hold the necessary consultations.

44. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said that she was unaware that any arrangements had been made to televise the meeting but that, in accordance with established practice, any information service accredited to the United Nations could do so provided it had the necessary authorization. She did not know whether it was the information services of her own country that had asked for the meeting to be televised but in any event her delegation had no control whatsoever over them.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) remarked that the United States information media did not normally pay much attention to United Nations activities and tended to be rather discriminatory in their choice of items.

46. As far as established practice was concerned, he pointed out that a precedent was not necessarily good merely because it was a precedent. It should be remembered that some countries could not afford certain types of service and were therefore in a position of inferiority in relation to the others. He formally requested that the entire debate on the items at present under consideration should be televised.

47. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) speaking on a point of order, asked for the statement of the Norwegian representative to be reproduced in full in the record of the meeting, in view of the important remarks he had made about the Manifesto on southern Africa adopted by the sixth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity.

48. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that in his opinion the summary record was sufficient. He hoped that the representative of the Central African Republic would not press her request.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.