



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.304  
29 February 1960

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Twelfth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 27 January 1960, at 2.45 p.m.

CONTENTS

Study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices: report prepared by the Special Rapporteur, Mr. A. Krishnaswami (E/CN.4/Sub.2/200, 202, 204, 205; E/CN.4/Sub.2/NGO/12, 13, 15; E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.159, L.196 and L.199) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. INGLES	(Philippines)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. SAARIO	(Finland)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. HALPERN	(United States of America)
	Mr. HISCOCKS	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
	Mr. JUVIGNY	(France)
	Mr. KETRZYNSKI	(Poland)
	Mr. KRISHNASWAMI	(India)
	Mr. MAKKAWI	(Lebanon)
	Mr. MATSCH	(Austria)
	Mr. MIRGHANI	(Sudan)
	Mrs. MIRONOVA	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT	(Uruguay)
	Mr. SCHAULSOHN	(Chile)
	Mr. SHARAF	(United Arab Republic)
<u>Observers from Member States:</u>		
	Mr. RASY	Cambodia
	Mr. TEKOAH	Israel
<u>Observer from a non-Member State:</u>		
	Mr. DANKWORT	Federal Republic of Germany
<u>Representative of a specialized agency:</u>		
	Mr. AKRAWI	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<u>Representatives of non-governmental organizations:</u>		
<u>Category B and Register:</u>		
	Mr. MOSKOWITZ	Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations
	Miss LUCKE	International Federation of University Women
	Mrs. ASCHER	World Federation for Mental Health
	Mrs. POLSTEIN	World Union for Progressive Judaism
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. HUMPHREY	Director, Division of Human Rights
	Mr. LAWSON	Secretary of the Sub-Commission

/...

STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF RELIGIOUS RIGHTS AND PRACTICES: REPORT PREPARED BY THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR, MR. A. KRISHNASWAMI (E/CN.4/Sub.2/200, 202, 204, 205; E/CN.4/Sub.2/NGO/12, 13, 15; E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.159, L.196 and L.199)  
(continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Commission to resume its discussion of the draft resolution in document E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.159, and the amendments to it (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.196 and 199).

Mr. MATSCH believed that all members of the Sub-Commission were in agreement with the basic ideas expressed in the draft resolution. The proposed amendments were mostly a matter of wording. Some of them appeared to be acceptable but he would draw Mrs. Mironova's attention to the fact that, in the context of the Nürnberg tribunal, "United Nations" meant the wartime alliance of certain nations and not the organization founded by the San Francisco Charter. With regard to operative paragraph 6 of part B of the draft resolution, he would point out to Mr. Krishnaswami that the action suggested in it was voluntary and not obligatory.

It was a good augury that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had been the first to offer its participation in the actions proposed in the draft resolution, as was stated in the letter from the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Secretary-General circulated to the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/Sub.2/204). He further drew the Sub-Commission's attention to the fact that the West German Bundestag, in a resolution adopted on 20 January, had already condemned the outbreak of anti-Semitic vandalism as a disgrace. The Government of his own country had already taken steps towards the passing of a law decreeing severe punishment for the perpetrators of such acts. The most important thing was to prevent the present outbreaks from assuming catastrophic proportions. He believed that the Sub-Commission could draft a text on the subject which would be unanimously adopted.

Mr. SAARIO observed that the whole world had been disturbed by the recent outbreaks of racial and religious hostility. It was true that the incidents had been scattered, that there was nothing so far to indicate any organized leadership behind them, and that those caught in the act had been irresponsible young persons. Nevertheless, there might be a sinister meaning in them and they might, if uncontrolled, lead to disaster. He therefore entirely supported the immediate and long-term steps envisaged in the draft resolution. The matter was urgent and the Sub-Commission should act quickly in response to the request of the

/...

(Mr. Saario)

International League for the Rights of Man. In becoming a sponsor of the draft resolution, he had been prompted by the conviction that a dispassionate attitude was essential where religion was concerned; bigotry and intolerance could lead only to unrest and misery. He earnestly hoped that the Sub-Commission would be able to find a text which could be adopted unanimously. Unanimity was of especial importance in the present matter. He agreed with Mrs. Mironova that it went beyond the purely religious and racial and extended into much broader realms. He had no objection, therefore, to the introduction of certain of those other elements into the draft resolution in so far as they fitted within its framework and if they could be agreed on unanimously. With regard to operative paragraph 6 of part B, he had the same misgivings as Mr. Krishnaswami, and indeed had opposed the inclusion of the paragraph in the first place, for he believed that it was not part of the duties of members of the Sub-Commission to transmit observations and information. He would therefore ask for a separate vote on that paragraph and would abstain.

Mr. HISCOCKS, speaking as a sponsor of the draft resolution, said that it was important for the United Nations, as the channel for the expression of the conscience of mankind, to react promptly to the events of the past weeks and that it should do so unanimously. He was among those who had believed that it should react more quickly than it was doing and would have been glad had it demonstrated the greater adaptability which would have made that possible. While the importance of the incidents which had occurred should not be exaggerated, their number was quite substantial and their cause a mystery. He believed that there was a good case for a careful investigation, as proposed in the draft resolution, which would be a specific contribution to the prevention of further outbreaks of the kind.

He had no objection to Mrs. Mironova's amendments 2 and 4, but certain others seemed to prejudge the issue. There was no evidence that the manifestations had been organized. Such expressions as "well-planned campaign" were therefore inappropriate. He would prefer the retention of the simpler and less specific terms of the original draft. With reference to operative paragraph 6, he was inclined to agree with Mr. Krishnaswami that members of the Sub-Commission could not be asked to transmit observations and information and it was pointless for the Sub-Commission to seek the invitation unless it could be sure that its

(Mr. Hiscocks)

response would be strong. He was not happy, however, about Mr. Krishnaswami's own suggestion in that connexion, since it seemed to imply that the procedure proposed in operative paragraph 6 would in fact be adopted. He would urge Mr. Halpern to consider deleting the word "immediately" in operative paragraph 7; it would be sufficient for the Secretary-General to transmit such information as he might have to the members of the Sub-Commission at reasonable intervals.

Mr. SCHAULSOHN noted the unanimous desire of members of the Sub-Commission to adopt a strong stand on the present issue and observed that all were generally in favour of the draft resolution. The amendments put forward were mainly a matter of wording and he hoped that it would be possible to adopt a substantial resolution on the subject. He agreed with Mr. Krishnaswami that operative paragraph 6 of part B should be deleted, for it was not appropriate to ask members of the Sub-Commission to submit information on matters on which they would be passing judgement at a later stage. If they had any information they would be able to give it at the proper time.

It was important that Members of the United Nations should give concrete expression to the principles they endorsed. His own country, Chile, was taking the lead in that respect. The Parliamentary Committees of the Chilean Senate had adopted a unanimous resolution denouncing the manifestations of racial hatred and persecution which had occurred in Germany and had spread to other countries and declaring such manifestations to be contrary to the principles of peaceful coexistence and of respect for the human person.

Mr. JUVIGNY felt that there was little to add to what previous speakers had said. He believed it to be the duty of the Sub-Commission forcefully to condemn those manifestations and to help to prevent a resurgence of a movement which had in the past sent so many millions to their death. The Sub-Commission was a small body, but he believed that its condemnation would have some influence on public opinion. It was important to concentrate on long-term efforts to prevent the recurrence of such outbreaks; the actions and efforts of individuals and groups would perhaps be more significant in that respect than the acts of Governments.

(Mr. Juvigny)

The root causes of the recent incidents must be found and eradicated. Repressive measures alone were not enough. Mass education programmes, as the resolution suggested, should be undertaken. He was convinced that UNESCO would give every attention to the resolution adopted at the recent conference of non-governmental organizations and would be guided by its recommendations in planning measures to combat such discrimination. It was with that double goal in mind, the immediate and the long-term, that the Sub-Commission should endorse the draft resolution before it.

Mr. KETRZYNSKI observed that when war had ended in 1945 none could have imagined a resurgence of Hitlerism only fifteen years later. The fact had to be accepted that Nazism was not dead. The incidents were too many and had affected too many countries to be dismissed as merely the work of madmen and practical jokers. The speed with which the epidemic had spread was itself evidence that there was everywhere fertile ground for the renewal of Hitlerism. Indeed there was clear evidence from the press that there were in existence well-supported organizations of former Nazis which were systematically preparing for such a renewal. The object of the recent demonstrations had obviously been not simply an attack on Jews. The symbol of the swastika daubed on a synagogue wall was being used as a general appeal to latent Hitlerism. The importance of recent events must not, therefore, be underestimated. Poland, which had suffered more than any other under Nazi persecution, feared the consequences of a new wave of nationalism in the Federal Republic of Germany. Poland had constantly drawn attention to the dangers of blind complacency and of re-arming a country whose army officers had a Nazi past. The present incidents, we believed, were profoundly political in nature. The world was only now beginning to awake to the danger which had remained throughout the last fifteen years. The representative of the American Jewish Committee had, only a day or two before, given the Sub-Commission some impressive figures on the penetration of Nazis into the spheres of education, administration and justice in the Federal Republic of Germany. The President of the World Jewish Congress had warned that the germ of the Nazi infection existed everywhere. The United Nations should therefore be on its guard. Strong action was called for. He was glad to note the healthy reaction of the world at large

/...

to the manifestations and appreciated the statement of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, but he did not think that that Government had done all that it could do. The Sub-Commission should adopt a unanimous resolution. In its present formulation the draft resolution was far too vague. It should be made much more specific and concrete. To that end the ideas suggested by Mrs. Mironova in her amendments ought to be incorporated in the text.

Mr. AKRAWI (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) outlined, for the benefit of the Sub-Commission, the activities and studies which UNESCO had been or would be carrying out in its programme to combat discrimination and prejudice in all its forms, a programme which it was undertaking in pursuance of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 1 of its own Constitution. UNESCO had already published ten booklets on race problems: it would shortly be issuing them in French together with two new publications in English. It had also published four booklets studying the race question in the light of religious thought. A manual prepared under UNESCO auspices on race prejudice and education had recently been put out by a London publisher and UNESCO was negotiating with the National Commissions of a number of Member States who were prepared to issue the manual, either in its original or in an adapted form. It was intended, under the 1961-1962 programme to publish three new studies in the "Race Question and Modern Science" and the "Race Question and Modern Thought" series. In response to resolution 1 (II) of the Second United Nations Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations UNESCO intended to organize a conference of sociologists, educationists and representatives of non-governmental organizations to discuss methods of combating racial prejudice among young people. An international seminar was also to be held, in co-operation with certain non-governmental organizations, on educational techniques for combating discrimination and prejudice and promoting inter-group understanding. For the past ten years UNESCO had consistently maintained a programme of studies and other activities designed to throw light on the question of prejudice and discrimination. He could assure the Sub-Commission that UNESCO would continue to work vigorously in that field and that it would give its full support to the implementation of the resolution now under consideration.

Miss SEIGER, (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) expressed the Confederation's entire support for the draft resolution condemning the resurgence of racial and religious hatred in various parts of the world. Opposition to discrimination had been among the articles of the Confederation drawn up at the Founding Congress in 1949. Since that time the ICFTU had used every endeavour to combat the expression of racial and religious hatred. More important, it taught its trade union members how to combat those feelings in themselves as well as in their fellow workers and neighbours. It exercised constant vigilance to ensure that the unions which were members of the ICFTU did not practice discrimination or tolerate it in their countries. At its last biennial Congress it had adopted resolutions on such subjects as the fight against colonialism and racial discrimination, and trade unions based on race. It therefore welcomed the draft resolution now before the Sub-Commission and promised its fullest support in its implementation.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT, speaking as a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.159), said it was the clear duty of the Sub-Commission to speak out against the recent resurgence of racial and religious hatred, which constituted one of the worst forms of discrimination. It was gratifying to note that few such outrages had occurred in Latin America. There was no apartheid in Latin America and the principles of the Charter with respect to non-discrimination on the grounds of race and religion were fully respected. The creation of independent States was one of the main achievements of the United Nations, particularly that of the State of Israel.

While completely in agreement with the general terms of the joint draft resolution he had a few minor amendments to suggest. It was not clear why the term "so-called" had been inserted before the words "racial prejudices" in the first preambular paragraph. The expression would be much more forceful if that rather vague adjective were omitted. He would also like further clarification of Mrs. Mironova's amendment to that paragraph (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.196, paragraph 1) and particularly of the phrase "other manifestations of national, racial and religious animosity". In paragraph 1 of part A the reference to the Charter should be elaborated.



(Mr. Rodriguez Fabregat)

In part B, paragraph 3, it seemed wrong to equate "public authorities" with "private organizations" since it was mainly the former that initiated programmes of education. He agreed with the Special Rapporteur that a new paragraph dealing with education should be inserted after paragraph 2 although the actual wording might be simplified. However, he could not support the proposal to delete paragraph 6. The members of the Sub-Commission should be able to transmit their individual views and any information they had on anti-Semitic manifestations to the Secretary-General so that any action subsequently taken could be based on the fullest possible data.

Mrs. MIRONOVA pointed out that she had submitted her amendments (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.196) because the text of the joint draft resolution was far too weak. The Sub-Commission was not dealing with "so-called racial prejudices" but with wilful acts of discrimination and with a resurgence of the crimes committed by the Nazis. Although in her previous statement she had been reluctant to refer to specific countries, the question put to her by Mr. Rodriguez Fabregat and the somewhat misleading communication from the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany (E/CN.4/Sub.2/204) compelled her to describe the situation in the Federal Republic of Germany in greater detail. According to the United States press, there were approximately seventy neo-Nazi organizations in that country and former Nazis held important posts throughout its administration. There was a growing tendency, particularly in the sphere of education, to rehabilitate the Hitler regime.

The CHAIRMAN requested Mrs. Mironova to confine her remarks to the joint draft resolution and not to refer to specific countries.

Mrs. MIRONOVA explained that her references to the Federal Republic of Germany had been prompted by the wording of the draft resolution which spoke of "so-called racial prejudices". She assumed that she was in order in giving examples of such prejudices.

Mr. KETRZYNSKI thought that it would be difficult to discuss the recent outbreaks of anti-Semitism without reference to Germany which was after all the original source of such manifestations.

/...

The CHAIRMAN said that, under its terms of reference, the Sub-Commission was responsible for making studies and recommendations concerning the prevention of discrimination of any kind relating to basic human rights. Its normal practice was to avoid explicit references to individual countries. Indeed, it would be exceeding its terms of reference if, instead of making general recommendations, it pronounced judgement on the situation existing in particular countries. If the Commission on Human Rights adopted part B of the joint draft resolution, then the terms of reference of the Sub-Commission would be expanded. In part B, the Secretary-General was being requested to obtain from States Members information on anti-Semitic manifestations which had occurred within their borders. When such information was available the Sub-Commission could discuss the situation within the various countries. But even then, it could only do so for the purpose of making recommendations to prevent the recurrence of such manifestations, without in any way pronouncing judgement on any specific country.

Mr. SCHAULSOHN thought the joint draft resolution should contain some reference to the spontaneous reaction which had occurred in certain countries against the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism. He therefore proposed that a third preambular paragraph should be inserted in part A to read as follows:

"Expressing its satisfaction that some peoples, through their Governments and private organizations, have reacted spontaneously in that manner;"

In part B the following words should be inserted at the end of the preamble "and also the spontaneous reactions that have occurred in some countries repudiating such manifestations".

Mrs. ASCHER (World Federation for Mental Health) pledged the support and co-operation of her Federation in implementing any resolution condemning manifestations of religious and racial prejudice. It recognized in particular the importance of paragraph 3 and sub-paragraph 4 (4) in part B of the joint draft resolution.

Her organization, which united researchers and practitioners in many social sciences, had gained insight in to the maladjustments underlying anti-social manifestations and felt that long-term preventive work was essential. Punitive

(Mrs. Ascher, World Federation  
for Mental Health)

measures by public authorities would not eliminate discriminatory behaviour. Its cause must be understood and dealt with constructively. The Federation had already taken positive steps in that direction: it had maintained study groups in various countries and had co-operated in national and international seminars. It was ready to place their findings at the disposal of international organizations.

The Federation would be glad to bring the Sub-Commission's resolution to the attention of 115 mental health societies in fifty-two countries and to urge them to co-operate with official and voluntary organizations in each country so that their special knowledge could be brought to bear on the long-term solution of the difficult problems of racial and religious discrimination that presented such threats to world peace.

Mrs. POLSTEIN (World Union for Progressive Judaism) expressed her organization's deepest concern at the recent anti-Semitic manifestations and its unqualified support for the joint draft resolution. The Executive Committee of the World Union had adopted a resolution viewing with considerable alarm the recent outbreak of anti-Jewish activities throughout the world and urging the United Nations to take vigorous action to suppress them. With particular reference to paragraphs 5 to 8 inclusive of part B of the joint draft resolution, her organization requested the Sub-Commission to consider the distribution of collated progress reports to Governments and to the non-governmental organizations concerned on the steps taken to combat the problem of religious and racial prejudice.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ (Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations) said that the recent anti-Semitic incidents posed in a compelling manner the question whether the irrationality and inhumanity which had erupted a generation ago had been brought under control. It was the responsibility of the United Nations to seek an answer to that question. Until the answer was found, the uncertainties surrounding such incidents would be a constant source of confusion and diversion. Hence, it was in the best interests of all concerned to promote the study of the causes and possible consequences of such incidents. Until methods were devised to identify such manifestations and to anticipate their character from the moment of their appearance, there could be no assurance that they would not lead to another catastrophe. The draft resolution before the Sub-Commission sought not

/...

(Mr. Moskowitz, Consultative Council  
of Jewish Organizations)

only to establish the extent of the recent incidents but also to inquire into their origins and character; thus, even though drafted under the pressure of special events, it dealt with a serious problem which in the normal course of events could not long have escaped the Sub-Commission's attention. He suggested that the Sub-Commission consider the advisability of appointing a sub-committee to make a preliminary examination and evaluation of the information received, so that the Sub-Commission would have a concrete basis of discussion at its next session.

Miss LUCIE (International Federation of University Women), after referring to her Federation's statement (document E/CN.4/Sub.2/NGO/17), which dealt with agenda item 7, said that, in connexion with the present item, her Federation wished to emphasize its conviction that positive and fundamental measures to eliminate prejudice and superstition from men's minds were the province not only of governments but also of all the agencies and media that participated in the process of education in the broadest sense of the term.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Sub-Commission, said that he shared the abhorrence and deep concern expressed by the preceding speakers concerning the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism and other religious prejudices. However, the resolution to be adopted by the Sub-Commission should not merely reflect the personal views of the members; it should represent the considered opinion of the Sub-Commission acting as a duly constituted organ of the Economic and Social Council operating within limited terms of reference. Thus, while he was in favour of draft resolution A (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.159), he thought that the general reference in operative paragraph 1 to "the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" was too vague. He suggested that specific reference to the pertinent articles in the Charter and the Universal Declaration would assist the layman reading the document and would also do justice to the Sub-Commission's modest reputation for precision in the formulation of draft resolutions. He also wondered whether it was proper to use the word "condemns" in that paragraph. The Sub-Commission had never before condemned even the worst incidents of discrimination, but had limited itself to suggestions that discriminatory

(The Chairman)

situations should be corrected. Perhaps the word "deplores" might be sufficient. He noted that the General Assembly itself had used the word "condemns" with reference to the presence of foreign military forces in the territory of one State, although in another instance of invasion by other military forces, it had simply expressed "grave concern". He did not have the same misgivings regarding the word "condemns" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B, since that resolution was proposed for the Human Rights Commission which had wider authority than the Sub-Commission and was composed of representatives of Governments. With respect to draft resolution B he agreed that operative paragraph 4 would be useful in authorizing the Secretary-General to obtain information and that operative paragraph 8 properly gave the Sub-Commission the task of evaluating materials and making the corresponding recommendations. However, he had some doubts whether the Sub-Commission should, in the same resolution, include operative paragraphs 2 and 3. Those paragraphs seemed to prejudge the issue. Paragraph 2, for example, urged States to adopt additional laws and to enforce existing ones vigorously, before information from Governments on the measures they had taken had been received and evaluated. Should the Human Rights Commission approve the resolution and materials be received from Governments, he wondered whether the Sub-Commission would have anything left to do if operative paragraphs 2 and 3 had already been adopted. It might therefore be advisable to modify the terms of paragraph 2 on the lines of General Assembly resolution 103 of 1946 or rule 16, recently adopted by the Sub-Commission, which urged public authorities to "endeavour to prevent" individuals and groups from practising discrimination. As regards paragraph 3, the sponsors had envisaged a somewhat detailed educational programme. That paragraph also assumed that prejudice was the only underlying cause of the manifestations being condemned, when other causes had been ascribed, such as racist views, hooliganism and even political ideologies. Operative paragraph 2(a) proposed by Mr. Krishnaswami (E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.199) was drafted along the lines of one of the conclusions reached by the Sub-Commission in its study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices, and might be a fitting substitute for operative paragraph 3. He also noted that operative paragraph 2 referred to "all" Member

/...

(The Chairman)

States whereas the manifestations had occurred in only thirty-four out of eighty-two Member States; a sense of proportion would require more specific language.

Mr. HALPERN was pleased to note that all members had agreed with the substance of the draft resolution before the Sub-Commission. He concurred in the Chairman's view that the Sub-Commission would not be in a position to express opinions on the causes of the manifestations until draft resolution B had been approved by the Human Rights Commission and the materials had been gathered. There was, however, a great difference between prejudging causes and dealing with manifestations. An analogy might be made to a court which passed judgement on a crime when the intent to commit a crime was evident from the act itself, although the motive for the act was unknown. He did not feel that any element of pre-judgement was involved in condemning the manifestations of anti-Semitism which were already well known. He agreed that there ought not to be any pre-judgement of the underlying causes of the manifestations.

Without necessarily committing his co-sponsors, he would like to suggest certain changes in the draft resolutions to take into account the amendments proposed by various members. The expression "other religious and so-called racial prejudices" in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A had been taken from General Assembly resolution 103 of 1946. The word "so-called" was intended to refer to race, not prejudices, and to make clear, as UNESCO studies had concluded, that the Jews did not constitute a race. He would be willing, however, to delete the expression altogether or to delete it and replace it by the phrase "and religious and racial prejudices of a similar nature". He did not accept Mr. Krishnaswami's proposal to replace "anti-Semitic" by "anti-Jewish", because the term "anti-Semitic" meant hostility to Jews only, and the expression would be easily understood by the public. He preferred the word "outrages" to the word "crimes" proposed by Mrs. Mironova because he thought it had greater emotional impact; he would, however, be willing to accept the addition of the words "committed by the Nazis prior to and during the Second World War". On the other hand, the other phrase Mrs. Mironova had suggested, "sternly condemned on behalf of the United Nations by the Nürnberg Tribunal",

/...

(Mr. Halpern)

was entirely inaccurate. The present United Nations had not been in existence at the time of the adoption of the Nürnberg Charter in 1945; there had not been a "stern condemnation" but a legal judgement, which was neither stern nor gentle; and the Nürnberg Tribunal had had no jurisdiction over crimes against humanity, unless they were war crimes or were ancillary to or subsidiary to aggressive warfare. That was underlined by the correction of the English and French texts of the Charter to conform to the Russian text so as to make clear the limited nature of the Tribunal's jurisdiction over crimes against humanity. It was also emphasized in the final judgement by the Tribunal.

Mrs. Mironova's proposed amendment to the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A was acceptable; he would, however, change the wording slightly to read: "it is the responsibility of the United Nations representing the international community ...". He would also agree to Mr. Schaulsohn's oral proposal to add a new preambular paragraph, expressing gratification at the spontaneous reaction against those manifestations.

He felt that changing the word "condemns" in operative paragraph 1 to "deplores", as suggested by the Chairman, would blunt the resolution's psychological impact, which was, in that instance, more important than its legal effect.

As for draft resolution B, he would attempt to meet Mrs. Mironova's proposals by inserting the whole text of the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A in the form he had just suggested. He would also agree to the additional clause proposed by Mr. Schaulsohn and to Mrs. Mironova's proposal for a separate second preambular paragraph. As for operative paragraph 1 of resolution B, he would accept the wording proposed by Mrs. Mironova. He asked Mr. Krishnaswami to reconsider his proposal to insert the word "immediately" in operative paragraph 2; the word "appropriate" would cover the point, particularly since in some countries there was no need for immediate action. The co-sponsors had thought that the words "if necessary" would indicate that only some of the Member States would have to take action. However, to meet the Chairman's objections, he would propose the deletion of the word "all" after the word "Urges" and the insertion of the phrase ", wherever the problem exists," after

/...

(Mr. Halpern)

the word "agencies". He could not accept Mrs. Mironova's proposal to replace the words "public authorities" in operative paragraph 3 by the words "State authorities", because in United Nations parlance the word "State" meant Member States and those educational programmes would often have to be carried out by local authorities. He could not agree with Mr. Rodriguez Fabregat's objection to mentioning both public authorities and private organizations; there were many great universities and philanthropic organizations which could undertake educational programmes of the kind proposed. Mr. Krishnaswami's proposed addition of paragraph 2 (a) on education did not, he feared, express Mr. Krishnaswami's own views as well as his oral remarks had expressed them; the term "education" had been used, as Mr. Halpern had explained, in the broadest possible sense; its full content could not be spelled out without making the resolution very lengthy. He would prefer to leave the resolution on that point in its present form with the understanding that it embraced the various kinds of education to which both he and Mr. Krishnaswami had referred in their earlier remarks. In deference to the Chairman's objection to prejudging, he proposed the substitution of "reflected in" for "underlying" in operative paragraph 3. He did not wish operative paragraph 6 to be deleted, but to meet the objections that had been made to that paragraph, he proposed a redraft in the following terms: "Invites the members of the Sub-Commission, in their individual capacity as experts, to transmit to the Secretary-General any observations and information which they may have on the above topics;". Finally, to satisfy Mr. Hiscocks' objection to the word "immediately" in operative paragraph 7, he would delete "immediately on its receipt" and insert "from time to time as received".

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.