

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1711th
MEETING

Friday, 21 November 1969,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 55, 56 and 57:

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

- (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

353

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. AL-JABIRI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he had listened with great attention to the remarks made at the 1709th meeting by the representative of the United States, Mrs. Rita Hauser, in her explanation of vote. Those remarks could not be passed over without comment, especially as she claimed that she herself and her delegation were the champions and the defenders of human rights in the Committee.

2. One was led to wonder about the motive behind the judgement of the situation of the Arabs who lived in their own countries which the representative of the United States had made. In presenting their case as if they were citizens of Israel captured and tortured by Arab Governments during the June war of 1967 she seemed to deny the right of citizenship to the Arab Jews. She had said that the Jewish population of Syria and Iraq had been deprived of their human rights, and she considered herself shocked and disappointed at the anti-Jewish resurrections in the Arab world. The United States representative also considered the resolution adopted by the Committee at the preceding meeting to be prejudiced and unbalanced. He had again and again tried to evaluate her speech to assess how much fairness and honesty it contained.

3. Had the representative of the United States by the same token condemned the policy of occupation and humiliation adopted by Israel, she could have freed herself from being labeled as prejudiced and biased toward Israel and world Zionism. She had tried to present Israel as the innocent victim in the Middle East, and she probably wished to profess her inclination to support and encourage Israel aggression for further occupation, annexation and massacre until the Zionist dream was realized.

4. The United States representative, who had spoken so emotionally in defence of Israel, had herself championed the recent Zionist Conference held in October 1969 in California, the theme of which was "How to correct the Israeli image in the United States".

5. The position adopted by the United States delegation reflected the United States Government's gratitude for the

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

AGENDA ITEMS 55, 56 and 57

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*concluded*) (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,

support it received from Israel and from the world Zionist movement in its policy of aggression against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Zionism blindly supported the United States policy of aggression in Viet-Nam, and the United States in turn gave Israel all the economic, political and military assistance it needed. That was made clear in the statement of Nahum Goldman, the president of the World Zionist Congress, in his autobiography, to the effect that Israel could count on political, economic and possibly military help in her fight against the Arabs only if the millions of Jews in the rest of the world exerted all the influence and economic pressure they could command; furthermore, to a certain extent the United States Government had to consider the wishes of Jewish voters. Mr. Goldman had also said that, "It would be hypocritical or self-deceptive to deny that, in decisions of American foreign policy concerning Israel and the Arabs, the political influence of six million American Jews plays a significant role, if only because their concentrations in the great urban centres makes them a factor in elections".

6. Zionism's alliance with the United States policy of aggression had clearly been reflected in Prime Minister Golda Meir's congratulations to President Nixon after his speech of 3 November 1969 on his policy of aggression in Viet-Nam. The fact was that when permanent members of the Security Council and major Powers, which were entrusted with a special responsibility for the maintenance of peace, security and justice, supported an aggressor, the régimes in Israel, South Africa and other countries which refused to comply with United Nations resolutions could but be encouraged. That was the main reason why the United Nations was weak and why its resolutions were not observed. It was therefore high time to call upon the United States to stop encouraging Israel and forcing countries to vote against the right of peoples to freedom and independence.

7. In his recently published book *Present at the Creation*, Dean Acheson, former United States Secretary of State, stated that, in opening the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration, President Truman had not acted in the interest of the United States but had been converted to Zionism by his aides.

8. That showed how the policy-makers of the United States had freely sold themselves and their conscience to world Zionism. The representative of the United States should heed the words of Israel's first Prime Minister, which had been published in *The New York Times* on 31 July 1968, regarding his meeting with the late President Kennedy, when he had told Ben-Gurion, "I was elected by the Jews of New York and I would like to do something for the Jewish people". Ben-Gurion had replied, "I was shocked; why should he say such a thing to a foreigner?"

9. The people of Palestine were determined to liberate their country and to regain their rights, no matter how many fighter aircraft were supplied to Israel by United States imperialism. Inspired by the example of the heroic struggle of the people of Viet-Nam for freedom and independence, the people of Palestine would continue the fight to assert their rights with the help of the entire Arab people and freedom fighters throughout the world.

10. With regard to the Israel representative's comments concerning the situation of the Kurdish minority in Iraq, he would draw his attention to the daily newspaper *Al Nur*, the official organ of the Kurdish Democratic Party, and to the fact that many government positions in Iraq, at all levels, were held by Kurds; that showed that Iraqi citizens belonging to their ethnic group enjoyed the same rights as any other citizens and did not need the defence of the imperialists and their Zionist instigators.

11. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, objected to personal references made by the representative of Iraq. The statement to which that representative had referred was an expression of the views of the United States Government. She rejected any implication that the United States representative had been speaking in a personal capacity when she made that statement.

12. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the United States representative, in explaining her vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1739/Rev.1 at the 1709th meeting, had made certain comments which he felt obliged to refute. First, she had tried to justify her abstention from voting by referring to the talks which the great Powers were holding with a view to helping Mr. Jarring in his mission. That had been a deliberate attempt to distort the true purpose of the Jarring mission, which was authorized to deal with humanitarian questions only in a very general way, and not in the sense in which they were discussed in the Third Committee. Secondly, the United States representative had alleged that "anti-Semitic" arguments had been used in the debate—a statement which she should have supported with concrete evidence. Apparently, the United States representative identified any criticism of Israel and of Zionism with anti-Semitic sentiment, when in fact the two were entirely different in nature, in motive and in origin. If that line of argument were pursued, all those Member States, including the United States of America, which had voted in favour of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) could be accused of harbouring anti-Jewish sentiments. The same would have to be said of all the Member States—an overwhelming majority of the countries of four continents—which had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 2252 (ES-V) and 2452 (XXIII). In any event, anti-Semitism was a sin of the Christian West, not of the Arab world, and the reason why it was conjured up time and again was that Zionism could only perpetrate its aggression by using anti-Semitism as a shield.

13. The United States representative had identified her country's position on humanitarian questions with the position of the aggressor State of Israel; if that was not so, it must be demonstrated with deeds, and not with mere words. Glaring proof of the alliance between the United States and the State of Israel was the dispensation granted to United States citizens allowing them to enlist in the Israel army without losing their citizenship.

14. The United States representative had again deemed it necessary to criticize the treatment accorded to the Jewish communities in Syria and Iraq without adducing any concrete evidence. Where the Syrian communities were concerned, his country had nothing to be ashamed of and continued to maintain the position which it had stated clearly on a number of occasions. He emphasized that the

Jews in Syria were simply Syrian nationals of Jewish faith, just as there were in that predominantly Moslem country citizens who were Christian by religion; that proved that tolerance of a kind unknown to Zionism was practised in Syria. He therefore protested against the arbitrary and defamatory statements made by the United States delegation on the subject.

15. He was quite amazed at the United States representative's comment on the need for objective evidence to justify any condemnation of the violations of human rights committed by Israel. In order to provide such evidence, he would not refer again to the statements made by General Moshe Dayan or by Prime Minister Golda Meir herself, nor would he cite the countless cases of utter disregard of fundamental human rights by the Israel authorities which had been outlined to the Committee; instead, he would refer to official United Nations documents. As examples, he would draw the attention of the Committee to the reports submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-third¹ and twenty-fourth² sessions by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, which gave instances of specific violations of human rights in the occupied territories and of interference by the Israel authorities in the activities of UNRWA and noted the hardships and tribulations which the Palestine refugees were suffering because of Israel's refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. More impartial evidence than the statements contained in the Organization's own documents could hardly be found, and the United States delegation's reluctance to accept them as reliable seemed to reveal a failure to distinguish between the objective and the subjective.

16. With respect to the imposition of collective measures as a punishment for outbreaks of violence, a clear legal distinction should be established between what could be regarded as terrorism and what was an act of resistance. When a people was subjected to military occupation, when its rights were utterly disregarded and when it suffered oppression bordering on genocide, it was to be expected that a resistance movement would spring up. That was precisely what was happening in the areas that were occupied as a result of the conflict unleashed by Israel armed aggression, which had produced millions of victims. Consequently, anyone fighting for the liberation of the occupied territories was simply performing a patriotic duty, just as the clandestine groups in the European countries had done in fighting against occupation by the forces of Nazi Germany. Both were cases of resistance movements that were legally justified, and he did not see how any distinction could be made between them. Occupation resulting from armed aggression, on the other hand, was an illegal act contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to the norms of international law.

17. Lastly, the United States representative had urged the countries whose territories had been occupied to designate a protecting Power to ensure compliance with the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Although any attempt to resolve the

problems of the Middle East was to be welcomed, he wondered whether that proposal would mean disregarding all the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations organs aimed at ensuring the protection of the civilian population in the occupied territories and respect for their human rights and fundamental freedoms.

18. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply with respect to the United States representative's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1739/Rev.1, said that that statement had been an attempt to confer respectability on the Zionist dogma which held that any criticism of Zionism was automatically identical with anti-Semitism, and to proclaim Israel free of error. Nevertheless, there was a great difference between anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic attitudes, and it was not correct to attribute certain motivations to statements and then to use those motivations as a basis for criticizing the persons who had made the statements.

19. In her explanation of vote, the United States representative had said that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1739/Rev.1 was unbalanced. It might have been unbalanced if there had been Israel territories occupied by the Arab countries as well as Arab territories occupied by Israel and if the draft resolution had dealt only with the latter, but the accusation of unbalance was obviously unfounded when there were only Arab territories occupied by Israel.

20. Again, the United States representative had said that the draft resolution prejudged the questions to which it related. She had presumably been referring to the practices condemned in operative paragraph 3. Such practices had been openly admitted by the Israel authorities in the occupied territories. Furthermore, Israel had consistently refused to receive any United Nations investigating committee; consequently, to accept the United States representative's argument that the practices of the Israel authorities in the occupied territories could not be censured without prior investigation would be tantamount to abdicating the responsibilities of the Organization.

21. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) said he agreed with the view expressed by the Tanzanian representative at the preceding meeting, namely, that the words "to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 should not be replaced by the words "the Promotion of Racial Harmony", as proposed in the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2). He suggested, instead, that the words "for the purpose of promoting racial harmony" should be inserted at the end of that paragraph.

22. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) said that, in view of the sufferings that had been caused by nazism, no policy based on racism and racial discrimination should be underestimated. The current manifestations of nazism, regardless of the names under which they might hide, had a common aim: to occupy and dominate the continents of Africa, Asia and Latin America in the name of the superiority of the European races. The great fellow-feeling between the racist European régimes of South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia and Palestine therefore came as no surprise.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 13.*

² *Ibid., Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 14.*

23. His delegation could not agree that the designation of 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be changed in the manner proposed by the United Kingdom, as it was impossible to achieve racial harmony in Southern Rhodesia or South Africa when death sentences, torture and segregation were the only recompense the indigenous peoples received from the minorities in power.

24. He was, on the other hand, prepared to support the oral sub-amendment formulated by the representative of France at the preceding meeting.

25. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that she supported most of the points in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2; she also supported the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.1741), first, because she considered it advisable, for the reasons stated by the United Kingdom representative at the preceding meeting, to delete from the draft resolution the reference to neo-nazism, and, secondly, because she felt that the idea of promoting racial harmony was much more positive than the idea of combating racism and racial discrimination. She supported the suggestions made by the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with respect to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4, and also the French oral sub-amendment. In connexion with the financial implications of the draft resolution, she shared the concern expressed by several delegations and considered that Member States should assume greater responsibility in meeting the cost of the programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, especially with regard to the organization of a seminar on race relations.

26. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) expressed his support for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 and said, with regard to the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.1741), that neo-nazism was a revival of nazism and the reports concerning its appearance in various parts of the world could not be ignored. He did not wish to involve himself in the domestic affairs of any State, but he emphasized that the result of the recent elections in the Federal Republic of Germany was in fact a repudiation of neo-nazism.

27. With reference to operative paragraph 1, he agreed with the Tanzanian representative that racism and racial discrimination must be combated, but racial harmony must also be promoted; however, he was not in favour of deleting the words "to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", because both evils should be combated until they were completely eliminated.

28. He proposed that the references in the draft resolution to the "celebration" in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be replaced by "observance".

29. Mr. GUZMAN (Peru) said he was surprised that one of the controversial points in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, of which his delegation was a sponsor, should be the term "neo-nazism", since that was not meant to refer to the situation prevailing in any particular country, but to a specific kind of ideology.

30. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said the draft resolution under consideration reflected the debates in various United Nations organs concerning the elimination of racism and racial discrimination and, although it did not contribute anything new in that regard, it stressed the continuing need to combat both evils.

31. As for the first and third United Kingdom amendments, he did not believe that the use of the word "neo-nazism" in the draft resolution should cause any alarm, since it did not refer to the political panorama in a specific State, but to a kind of ideology. Nor did he support the deletion of the words "to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", which would unduly weaken the text.

32. Mrs. KUME (Japan) supported the idea of proclaiming 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, but said she was not so optimistic as to think that the mere designation of the Year would substantially contribute to the elimination of those two evils, which were the result of deep-rooted prejudices. The process of elimination would be long and arduous and must be supported by the greatest possible number of States. Consequently, the objective that was sought through the proclamation of the International Year should not be combined with any other aim which might elicit reservations from some Governments. Her delegation accordingly supported the first and third United Kingdom amendments, although the formula suggested by the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the preceding meeting was better.

33. As for the designation of the International Year, she would prefer a more elevated and constructive title, such as the one suggested by the representative of Jamaica. Finally, she believed that Governments should be allowed the greatest freedom in implementing the programme for the celebration of the International Year.

34. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) said the fact that there was no accepted definition of neo-nazism did not mean that all necessary efforts should not be made to combat it, in the same way as aggression must be combated even though it had not been possible to give it a precise conceptual definition. He was therefore in favour of retaining the reference to neo-nazism in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, with the sub-amendment proposed orally by the French delegation.

35. As for the designation of the International Year, he thought that the wording used in the draft resolution was preferable to the one proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2), since racial harmony would be a logical consequence of the disappearance of racism and racial discrimination.

36. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he supported the draft resolution, which summed up the work done over the years by United Nations bodies in their efforts to eliminate racism and racial discrimination. On the other hand, he was opposed to the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom delegation. He did not believe that the expression "neo-nazism" represented a new concept or that it had been newly coined, since it had already been used in documents of the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social

Council and the Teheran International Conference on Human Rights. He recalled that when resolution XXIV³ had been under discussion at that Conference, in which the Federal Republic of Germany had taken part, the only difference of opinion had been about the degree of danger represented by neo-nazism, but no representative, not even the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, had objected to the use of the expression.

37. As for the change in the designation of the international year, also proposed by the United Kingdom, he felt that the situation in some countries, such as South Africa or Southern Rhodesia, was so serious that it would be an insult to anyone fighting for freedom in those countries to propose racial harmony as an objective.

38. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) said some delegations had expressed the view that the concept of racial harmony proposed by the United Kingdom (see A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2) amounted to the same thing as action to combat racism and racial discrimination. However, that was obviously not the case, since, for example, the official objective of the policies of *apartheid* and segregation followed by the South African authorities was to promote racial harmony among the different ethnic groups in South Africa.

39. As for the deletion of the expression "neo-nazism", also proposed by the United Kingdom (*ibid.*, paras. 1 and 3), the main objection to the inclusion of that word in the draft resolution seemed to be the lack of a precise definition. He pointed out, however, that in its day there had been no precise definition of nazism. There was the same difference between nazism and neo-nazism as between colonialism and neo-colonialism. It was a fact that such phenomena had appeared in certain countries, and it mattered little what name was given to them. He added that neo-nazism was not linked to a specific State, and he was therefore surprised that it should be associated exclusively with the Federal Republic of Germany.

40. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, he accepted the sub-amendment proposed orally by the representative of France (see 1710th meeting, para. 32).

41. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2 but against the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2) because, although he was definitely in favour of racial harmony, it seemed to him that in the present circumstances racial harmony was a fiction which could not materialize so long as colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination persisted.

42. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she supported the draft resolution in general but doubted whether it would have any lasting effects. It should not be forgotten that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would not be observed in South Africa and Namibia. Unfortunately, the programme had been prepared along very traditional lines; that was perhaps the fault of

Governments, rather than of the Secretariat, which was responsible only for bringing together and co-ordinating the suggestions submitted by Governments. In her opinion, Secretariat officials would do better to go to South Africa and start a dialogue with the circles and groups concerned, instead of concentrating solely on the co-ordination of inter-agency activities—a task which, considering the amount of time available, could very well be accomplished by correspondence. She hoped, therefore, that the Commission on Human Rights would revise the programme for the International Year, taking into account the suggestions made in the Third Committee.

43. She was in favour of deleting the word "neo-nazism" from the draft resolution, as proposed by the United Kingdom. It was unfortunate that that term was generally used in connexion with the Federal Republic of Germany, when that country had shown a very positive attitude to the question by doing all it could to avoid a resurgence of nazism and had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

44. Where the International Year was concerned, she agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the word "observance" was more appropriate than "celebration". With regard to the title itself, she supported the United Kingdom amendment, although it seemed to her that it would be more realistic to say "the International Year for the Development of Racial Equality and Justice", along the lines of the suggestion by the representative of Jamaica. Finally, she was in favour of the French oral sub-amendment, since it had received general support, but she would have preferred, for example, the wording "racial discrimination and racial intolerance in all its forms and manifestations".

45. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that the draft resolution faithfully reflected the will of the international community to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations once and for all. The year 1971 must be one of action and struggle.

46. He was opposed to the United Kingdom amendment calling for the deletion of the word "neo-nazism" from the draft resolution, which was an attempt to avoid any reference to the responsibility of the Federal Republic of Germany for the resurgence of nazism. Nobody could deny that neo-nazism existed not only in Europe but also in certain parts of Asia, America and Africa, where it was gradually making its influence felt. It would be a grave error to delete the word, for that would be giving Nazi organizations the "green light".

47. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) said that he agreed with the ideas underlying draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, which he was prepared to support. He hoped that the Jamaican representative's suggestions would be taken into account, because they improved the text considerably. The compromise text proposed by the representative of France seemed very appropriate, since his delegation, like others, had some doubt about the exact meaning of the word "neo-nazism" and feared that, because of its political connotations, it could be interpreted loosely. It was important that the draft resolution should receive the widest possible, if not unanimous, support.

³ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.XIV.2), p. 18.

48. His delegation preferred the title originally given to the International Year because, although it was longer than the one proposed by the United Kingdom, it exactly described the objective that was sought. He also agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the word "observance" was more appropriate than "celebration".

49. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) said that she unreservedly supported the draft resolution. The Government and people of her country condemned any practice which violated human dignity, such as *apartheid* and nazism. She also agreed with the compromise wording proposed by France.

50. Mr. BARRY (Guinea) was opposed to changing the name of the International Year, as that would eliminate from the draft resolution the basic idea of action to combat racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations. There could be no harmonious relations between races until racism was eradicated, and no justice so long as colonial régimes still existed.

51. Mr. OKAH (Cameroon) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. In submitting the Manifesto on Southern Africa to the General Assembly at its 1780th plenary meeting on 6 October 1969, the President of the Cameroon had stressed the importance of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and suggested that, to crown the activities to be undertaken in that connexion, a seminar on the evils of racial intolerance should be held in Africa. The purpose of the seminar, which could be held at Yaoundé, would be to explain that phenomenon and to inform public opinion of its disastrous consequences. His delegation therefore hoped that the Committee would consider that proposal.

52. Mr. DESTREMAU (France) welcomed the proposal of the Cameroon that a seminar should be held on racial discrimination. The objective of the International Year was, of course, to put an end to a deplorable situation which still existed in southern Africa; he could therefore see why some delegations were not satisfied with the new name proposed by the United Kingdom. In any case, he would prefer a more positive name, such as "International Year for Action to Combat Racism and for the Effective Achievement of Racial Equality".

53. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) explained that his intention had by no means been to relegate the idea of action to combat racial discrimination to second place, but rather to stress the best way of achieving the eradication of that evil. In his view, that goal would be attained not by striking fear into people but by enlisting their full co-operation. So far as the actual name was concerned, he supported the Jamaican proposal that the concept of racial justice should be included.

54. He had noted that many delegations shared his doubts about the precise meaning of the term "neo-nazism". In that connexion, he wished to clarify one point: he had said that he thought the term "neo-nazism" was used particularly in connexion with the Federal Republic of Germany, and his view had been confirmed by the Tanzanian representative, who had described it as a European phenomenon. He had himself derived that view from the statement of the

USSR representative at the 1703rd meeting. If that speech had been intended to improve the relations of the USSR with the Federal Republic of Germany, he was surprised, but delighted. In any case, the formula suggested by France provided an acceptable solution and the first and third United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.1741, paras. 1 and 3) were therefore no longer necessary.

55. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Republics) said that, as several delegations had emphasized, neo-nazism existed and it was essential to combat it by every possible means. The representative of Uganda had rightly said that the concept referred to certain manifestations of nazism adapted to present circumstances, just as neo-colonialism was a contemporary form of colonialism. Action to combat that evil should not be opposed simply because the phenomenon was not a widespread one; one single case should be enough to alert the international community. Nevertheless, the sponsors had accepted the French oral sub-amendment in view of the general support which it commanded, on the understanding that the phenomenon was included among the contemporary manifestations of nazism. The action of the United Nations and of peace-loving and justice-loving peoples would in any case be directed towards the eradication of that evil, as another manifestation of racial intolerance.

56. With regard to the name of the International Year, the original version was the best one and there was no need to change it. In connexion with the comments of the representatives of Ceylon and Italy, he explained that the original Russian text of the draft resolution spoke not of "celebrating" but of "observing" the year, which was the term that should be used in all instances and in all languages. The following drafting changes had been made: in the second preambular paragraph, the words "the Charter of" had been added before the words "the United Nations"; in the English text of the fourth preambular paragraph, the word "level" should be in the plural; the word "concerned" had been added at the end of operative paragraph 6.

57. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the Secretariat would bear very much in mind the interest expressed by the Government of the Cameroon in participating actively in the observance of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination through the organization of a seminar on the subject, and would contact the Cameroonian delegation when the time came to make arrangements and to prepare a report on the question.

58. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) orally revised his amendment (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2), so that it proposed the replacement of the words "Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination" in the title and in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, as orally revised, by the expression "Social Justice".

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a roll-call vote was taken on the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2), as orally revised.

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

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, France, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Philippines, Swaziland, Turkey.

The amendment was rejected by 59 votes to 26, with 18 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1 and 2, as orally revised (see paras. 40 and 56 above).

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.

60. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) explained that she had voted in favour of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1741, para. 2) as orally revised, because it proposed a designation for the International Year which was not only more concise but was also broader, since the concept of racial justice necessarily included action to combat discrimination together with the obligation to promote racial harmony.

61. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that he had abstained from voting on the revised United Kingdom amendment because he attached equal importance to the promotion of racial justice and to action to combat racism and discrimination.

62. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) explained that she had abstained from voting on the revised United Kingdom amendment, not because she did not agree with the positive spirit underlying that proposal but because she had not wanted to go against the wish of the majority of the members of the Committee, who favoured the name originally given to the Year.

63. Mr. JACKMAN (Barbados) said that, had he been present during the vote on the revised United Kingdom amendment, he would have voted against that proposal, because the new wording would have diverted public attention from the need actively to combat racial discrimination.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.