

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



Saturday, 20 December 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting	429
Question of defining aggression: report of the Sixth Committee (A/2322 and Corr.1)	429
Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: report of the Third Committee (A/2328)	436
Draft convention on political rights of women: report of the Third Committee (A/2334)	438

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting

Pursuant to rule 67, it was decided not to discuss items 54, 27, 61, 11, 26 b, 63, 31, 37, 38, 32, 44, 26 a and 40 of the agenda of the General Assembly.

1. The PRESIDENT: It will be noted that all outstanding reports from Committees and other items are now on the agenda before us, and that provision has been made for the completion of this agenda by meetings this morning, this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon. If we can follow this procedure, that will mean that our work will be completed by the end of tomorrow afternoon's meeting. This, of course, will require that the explanations of vote should be short and relevant.

Question of defining aggression: report of the Sixth Committee (A/2322 and Corr.1)

[Agenda Item 54]

2. The PRESIDENT: It has been suggested that, in order to save time because of the long agenda before us, we might dispense with the rapporteurs' reports, if that is agreeable to the rapporteurs of the Committees concerned. Those reports are included in our documents, and I am sure that they have been studied by the members of the Committees. It is up to the Committees themselves. If the Rapporteur on a particular item wishes to make a report, I shall be glad to call on him.

Mr. Rechendorff (Denmark), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2322 and Corr.1) and then spoke as follows:

3. Mr. RECHENDORFF (Denmark), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: The composition of the special committee is given in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution. Allow me, in this connexion, to say that, as India has declared itself unable

to serve on the committee, it has, with the consent of the Sixth Committee, been replaced by Pakistan. The corresponding correction should therefore be made in the draft resolution.

4. Mr. IBRAHIM KHAN (Pakistan): I wish to explain my vote. My delegation proposes to abstain from voting on the question before the Assembly, namely, the defining of aggression, and I should like to say a few words in explanation of the line of action to be taken.

5. My delegation does not look upon the problem of defining aggression as one that will, for all time to come, defy our attempts to tackle it successfully. We have faith in the future and we have faith in the united will of the nations. We are not prepared to permit the changes that appear in the complexion of aggression from year to year to make the subject undefinable. Changes must be accepted, nay, even welcomed, as but a normal phase of a living society. A definition has to recognize them as an inevitable reality and to face them accordingly. We are therefore of the opinion that a definition of aggression is possible, and that a successful definition of the subject will add a new and inspiring chapter to the scriptures of our international relations.

6. My delegation, however, has some misgivings as to whether at the present stage of our advancement in the sphere of co-operative and collective action in international affairs, a definition of aggression would be practical or useful. Sharp differences of opinion among representatives of different nations have bristled up during the discussion. It appears that we have arrived at an intellectual unity in our desire for a definition of aggression, but we have failed to marshal our collective will to carry it through. The real obstacle on the way is thus essentially moral in character. The head has forged onward, the heart is lagging behind.

But we believe that days are assuredly coming when the nations of the world will draw closer to each other than they are today and when there will be a greater synthesis of their intellectual achievement, ethical outlook and political ideas, creating thereby an atmosphere that will be found congenial to defining aggression. At the present juncture in our international relations, we hardly visualize that an immediate prospect of success in the attempt at preventing the disturbance of world peace would be offered by the proposed definition.

7. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further explanations of votes, the Assembly will now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in the report [A/2322 and Corr.1], to which the Polish delegation has submitted an amendment (A/L.136).

8. We shall vote first on the Polish amendment, which is to replace the words "ninth session" by the words "eighth session" in paragraph 2 (a) and 3 of the operative part.

The amendment was rejected by 31 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions.

9. The PRESIDENT: A request has been made for separate votes on three parts of the draft resolution.

10. We shall vote first on the second paragraph of the preamble, beginning with the words "Considering that the discussion of this question" and ending with the words of sub-paragraph (e), "Any other problem which might be raised by a definition of aggression".

The paragraph was adopted by 28 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

11. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 2 (a) of the operative part.

Paragraph 2 (a) was adopted by 29 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

12. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 2 (b) of the operative part.

Paragraph 2 (b) was adopted by 23 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.

13. The PRESIDENT: Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 37 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

14. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom): In committee, my delegation voted against the draft resolution which has just been adopted. It did so because my delegation does not consider that it is either wise or useful at present to continue the study of the question of defining aggression.

15. The United Kingdom is, however, willing to co-operate to the best of its ability and resources in studying the question, if a majority of the members so wish.

16. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee.

17. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation considers it necessary to explain its vote on the draft resolution on the question of defining aggression approved by the Sixth Committee and adopted at this plenary meeting.

18. Working consistently towards the strengthening of international peace and security, the USSR Government has always attached great importance to the question of defining aggression. Its position has been that a definition of aggression is an effective means of ensuring international peace, a means of combating aggression and aggressors, as well as unjust and offensive wars waged for the purpose of enslaving other countries and peoples.

19. Accordingly, as early as 1933, the USSR Government submitted its proposal for a definition of aggression to the General Commission of the Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations,¹ proclaiming the guiding principles for the drafting of a definition of aggression. The USSR Government pointed out that the absence of such a definition would be of help only to aggressors, and not to States interested in strengthening international peace. The Soviet Union proposal for a definition of aggression was approved in principle by the said Commission; it subsequently formed the basis of a number of international agreements and has become one of the most important and most generally recognized principles of international law. In the present international situation, a definition of aggression, far from being a less topical issue is, we are deeply convinced, even more so. There is a pressing need to provide directives for the guidance of the appropriate international organs which may be called upon to determine the aggressor.

20. It is for that very reason that the USSR raised the question of defining aggression in the United Nations too, and proposed an item to that effect as long ago as the fifth session of the General Assembly [A/C.1/608]. As was to be expected, the proposal was received favourably by many States. That was shown at the sixth session, when the General Assembly rejected by an overwhelming majority the attempts made by the governments of a number of States which followed the lead of the United States to prevent the consideration of the question under various pretexts. Their chief and quite unfounded pretext was, and for that matter still is, that the concept of aggression could not be defined.

21. Notwithstanding the attitude taken by a number of States which opposed the USSR proposal even as they had opposed it in the League of Nations, the sixth session of the General Assembly recognized [resolution 599 (VI)] that it would be "possible and desirable, with a view to ensuring international peace and security . . . to define aggression by reference to the elements which constitute it". In that resolution, the General Assembly noted that "it would be of definite advantage if directives were formulated for the future guidance of such international bodies as may be called upon to determine the aggressor".

22. What happened during the discussion of the USSR proposal at the seventh session of the General Assembly? The discussion has shown that, as in the past, many States favour the proposal. Their attitude

¹ See League of Nations, Records of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Series B, Minutes of the General Commission, Vol. II, p. 237 (Series L.O.N., IX, Disarmament, 1933.IX.10).

towards the proposal is perfectly understandable. Since the days of the League of Nations, events have taken place which have left their mark on the life of many countries and peoples. As a result of the Second World War, many States have learned from their own experience that a decision on the question of defining aggression can only help the campaign to prevent aggression and to preserve peace.

23. Yet it should be noted that the discussions in the Sixth Committee on the USSR proposal have shown that, as the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Mr. Vyshinsky, rightly pointed out in his statement before the Committee on 4 December [341st meeting], the preparation of a definition of aggression was being opposed by the same States which had opposed the solution of the question in the past. Those States, he said, were now endeavouring to prevent the General Assembly from adopting the necessary decision in the matter, and, first and foremost among them was once again the United States. We know that in the Sixth Committee the United States delegation voted against the draft resolution, which the Committee approved, providing for the creation of a special committee to prepare draft definitions of aggression for consideration by the General Assembly, although it abstained in the vote in the Assembly.

24. The USSR delegation has repeatedly pointed out that there can be no justification for postponing a decision on this important question. We urged that the appropriate decision should be adopted at the present session, believing that the immediate adoption of a definition was possible and necessary, having regard to the generally recognized principles of international law with which the USSR draft was in full harmony. A number of States which agreed with the Soviet Union on the need for a definition of aggression stated, however, in the course of the debate in the Committee that they wished to study the question and the USSR proposal on it further, and would therefore prefer no decision to be taken for the time being. Among the delegations which supported the principle of the USSR proposal on the need for a definition of aggression, but felt that further study of the question would be desirable, were the delegations of Egypt, Syria, Iran, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Mexico and a number of others. Although it considered that any delay in the matter would be most undesirable, the USSR delegation nevertheless, in deference to the wishes of a number of other delegations, did not object to the proposal for the creation of the afore-mentioned special committee. It wishes, however, to point out that there are serious shortcomings in some parts of the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee.

25. In the first place, it should be noted that there can be no justification for postponing the consideration of the question of defining aggression until the ninth session of the General Assembly, that is to say, for a period of two years, as provided in the draft resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted. That is why we supported the Polish amendment [A/L.136] to that draft, which called for the inclusion of the question of defining aggression in the agenda of the eighth session of the General Assembly. The Sixth Committee draft resolution contains a number of provisions which may render the special committee's work more difficult and offer the opponents of a definition of aggression an

opportunity, this time within the special committee itself, to delay the settlement of this important question under various pretexts, and to prevent the United Nations from adopting a decision by reopening the question whether a definition of aggression is possible at all, even though the possibility of such a definition was clearly laid down in the resolution of the sixth session of the General Assembly.

26. The same applies to the provision, in the preamble to the resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted, concerning the need for study, by the special committee, of "the connexion between a definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security"—as if there could be any doubt on that score—and "the effect of a definition of aggression on the exercise of the jurisdiction of the various organs of the United Nations". The answer to both questions can be found in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth session.

27. The draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee also attempts to explain the failure of the International Law Commission to work out a definition of aggression by reference to the complexity of the question, whereas the real reason for its failure was not the complexity of the question, but its refusal to carry out the task conferred upon it by the fifth session of the General Assembly [resolution 378 B (V)]. At its sixth session, the General Assembly stated outright [resolution 599 (VI)] that "the International Law Commission did not... furnish an express definition".

28. The Sixth Committee draft resolution which has just been adopted has some other shortcomings which may be exploited by the opponents of a definition of aggression, who are looking for various ways of obstructing the completion of that task. Notwithstanding these defects, the USSR delegation supported the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee, and voted for the recommendation to set up a special committee.

29. In conclusion, I should like to say that we are anxious to make the position of the USSR on the question of defining aggression quite clear. It must not be thought that the Soviet Union is the only country interested in the adoption of a decision on the question of defining aggression. The Soviet Union submitted its proposal on the question to the League of Nations, and again submitted its proposal to the United Nations because, from the first moment of its existence, the Soviet State has firmly and consistently upheld the cause of peace and considers that the maintenance of peace and the prevention of war are in the vital interests of all nations, large and small, and that war serves the purposes of only a handful of monopolists, millionaires and multi-millionaires of a few States, who make enormous profits out of war and preparation for war. A definition of aggression and the decisions taken to that effect are primarily in the interests of the small States which, as experience has shown, are often the first victims of aggression, being unable to offer the necessary resistance to the aggressor and to defend their independence. It goes without saying that the USSR, which has been defending the cause of peace firmly and consistently, will also defend its proposal in the special committee, emphasizing the need for the adoption by the United Nations of a definition of aggression, in the conviction that the

adoption of such a decision will constitute an important step forward in the strengthening of international peace and security.

30. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR attaches great importance to the question of defining aggression, since it considers that such a definition would be a valuable instrument in the campaign against aggression and would help to avert the threat of a new world war. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore continues to give its full support to the USSR proposal for defining aggression.

31. The definition of aggression submitted by the Soviet Union for the consideration of the General Assembly has been confirmed by the practice of many States in concluding conventions and is now one of the important and generally recognized principles of international law. The proposal of the Soviet Union contains guiding principles for the use of such international bodies as may be called upon to determine the parties guilty of aggression, and a list is given of those acts on the part of States which should be described as acts of aggression. The proposal of the Soviet Union also refers to the circumstances which cannot be used as a justification for aggression, and which in fact are usually alleged as a pretext to cloak aggression. The adoption of the definition of aggression submitted by the Soviet Union would undoubtedly be a valuable means of deterring an aggressor; it would contribute to the strengthening of peace and international co-operation and would also promote the solution of other urgent problems connected with the maintenance of peace and security among the nations.

32. It is particularly important to define aggression at the present time, when the United States has passed from the stage of propaganda and preparation for war to overt acts of aggression, such as the aggression against Korea and the People's Republic of China, and the so-called Mutual Security Act adopted in October 1951, with the supplementary Act of June 1952. As everybody knows, the States which belong to the Atlantic bloc, headed by the United States, are preventing the General Assembly from adopting any measures calculated to strengthen peace and security among the nations. It is those States which are the most determined opponents of a definition of aggression.

33. The absence of any political or legal grounds for the argument that it was inexpedient to define aggression was fully demonstrated in the speech made in the Sixth Committee by the Chairman of the USSR delegation, Mr. Vyshinsky, who disclosed the real causes of the stubborn opposition of the governments of certain States to a precise and clear definition of aggression. Attempts to prevent the continuation of work on the definition of aggression were also rightly opposed by the representatives of a number of other countries, particularly by those of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Mexico.

34. The results of the consideration at the seventh session of the General Assembly, of the question of defining aggression, and the results of the voting in the Assembly, show that the opponents of a definition of aggression have again suffered defeat. The General

Assembly has now adopted a decision providing for the further consideration of the question of defining aggression.

35. The Ukrainian delegation still considers that a definition of aggression could and should have been adopted at the present session of the General Assembly. Since, however, a considerable number of delegations, while recognizing in theory the importance and the necessity of defining aggression, at the same time expressed the desire in the Sixth Committee that the United Nations should give further study to this question, we supported the proposal for the establishment of a special committee to consider the question of defining aggression and report to the General Assembly.

36. At the same time, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that some of the provisions in the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee should have been deleted because they might lead to an incorrect interpretation and weakening of the resolution [599 (VI)] adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth session, on 31 January 1952—a resolution which refers to the desirability and importance of preparing a definition of aggression by reference to its constitutive elements.

37. The provisions which should have been deleted are to be found in the second paragraph of the preamble and in paragraph 2 (b) of the operative part. These refer to matters already decided by the resolution adopted at the sixth session of the General Assembly. That applies, for instance, to the question of "the connexion between a definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security" (mentioned in sub-paragraph (b) of the second paragraph of the preamble), and the question of "the effect of a definition of aggression on the exercise of the jurisdiction of the various organs of the United Nations" (sub-paragraph (d) of the same paragraph). In the afore-mentioned resolution adopted at the sixth session of the General Assembly, a definition of aggression was stated to be possible and desirable, with a view to ensuring international peace and security, and it was further stated that such a definition would—to repeat the words of the resolution—"be of definite advantage . . . for the future guidance" of such international bodies as might be called upon to determine the aggressor. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR further considered that the special committee should not be instructed to deal with topics not immediately connected with the preparation of a definition of aggression, for the performance of such tasks would undoubtedly divert the committee's attention from the problems with which it was immediately concerned. This applies to sub-paragraph (c) of the second paragraph of the preamble to the resolution, which proposes that the special committee should study "the problems raised by the inclusion of a definition of aggression in the code of offences against the peace and security of mankind . . .", and also to sub-paragraph (e) of that paragraph, which proposes the study of "any other problem which might be raised by a definition of aggression". These two questions constitute a separate problem, the study of which by the special committee would merely complicate its work.

38. For the reasons just described, the Ukrainian SSR voted against the second paragraph of the pre-

amble and against paragraph 2 (b) of the operative part of the draft resolution contained in the report of the Sixth Committee.

39. In the conviction that the adoption of a definition of aggression is a matter which brooks no delay, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted for the Polish delegation's amendment (A/L.136) to the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee, to the effect that the special committee should submit its report, not to the ninth, but to the eighth session of the General Assembly.

40. Considering that a solution of the question of defining aggression will undoubtedly be of assistance in the campaign against aggression and for the strengthening of international peace and security, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, in spite of the rejection of the Polish amendment, voted for the Sixth Committee's proposal for the establishment of a special committee to prepare a definition of aggression.

41. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKRTOVA (Czechoslovakia): In the spirit of the great decree on peace issued at the very birth of the first socialist State in the world, the Soviet Union in 1933 proposed a definition of aggression. This proposal, which was the first to be put before an international forum, was met by the stubborn resistance of those States which later unleashed the Second World War. Yet the Soviet Union definition of aggression, adopted in 1934 by eleven States, served as a direct basis for the Nürnberg and Tokyo judgments, and thus helped to bring just punishment upon those who, through their strivings for world domination, brought the horrors of total war upon mankind.

42. When, at the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet Union, in the spirit of its untiring policy of peace, proposed that aggression be defined and accordingly submitted a proposal, in substance embodying those principles which since 1933 had been a part of international law, it met with the opposition of today's aggressors, led by the United States. Under pressure by the United States, this proposal was referred to the International Law Commission which, under the same pressure, refused however to draw up such a definition.²

43. The Soviet Union proposal thus came back to the sixth session of the General Assembly. In spite of the opposition of the Atlantic bloc—that group of aggressors preparing a new war—General Assembly resolution 599 (VI) of 31 January 1952, to the effect that a definition of aggression is necessary and useful for the maintenance of world peace and international security, was adopted. It was also resolved that the question of defining aggression should be included in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly.

44. At this seventh session it was again only the United States and its partners in war alliances which, in opposing the precise and clear Soviet Union proposal, tried to prove that the present time was not appropriate for a definition of aggression, that the forms of aggression had changed, and that no definition

of aggression was possible. We can see that the aggressors of all times use the same excuses.

45. Those who are preparing a third world war simply fear a definition of aggression. They are particularly afraid of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in the Sixth Committee [A/C.6/L.264], which outlaws what are by now historical pretexts for aggression, and which unmasks their true intentions. The United States is attempting by every means to make force the basis of international relations—that well-known formula of a policy of force which it would like to apply with impunity in the realization of its plans for world domination.

46. At this session of the General Assembly too, the majority of the Member States have again confirmed that peaceful international relations have to be based on international law. Existing international law denounces aggression—that is, any aggressive act of one State against another State—as the most heinous crime against peace. The majority of States thus desire that this crime should be determined in law; that is, that a definition of aggression should be drawn up and adopted.

47. In the present situation of international tension, it is particularly timely to define aggression. The mere existence of such a definition, even if in itself not capable of preventing aggression, will constitute a sharp warning to the aggressors of the present time. This definition will make it impossible to misuse the United Nations, as in the case of China and Korea, in order to brand the victim of aggression as the aggressor. The definition will serve as an effective instrument of the organs of the United Nations, assisting them to fulfil the tasks enjoined upon them by the Charter for the maintenance of peace.

48. The Czechoslovak delegation, representing a country which was a victim of Munich treason of the Western Powers and of Hitlerite aggression, therefore considers it essential that a definition of aggression should be established as soon as possible. For these reasons, it welcomed the Soviet Union initiative and supported the Polish amendment [A/L.136], which aimed at enabling the eighth session of the General Assembly to adopt a definition of aggression. The Czechoslovak delegation was likewise in favour of the setting up of a special committee whose task it would be to draw up a definition of aggression, bearing in mind its constitutive elements. This committee has been entrusted with a responsible task. Its work, however, will not be difficult. There is the Soviet Union definition of aggression. Many delegations have already expressed themselves in favour of the Soviet Union proposal, which constitutes a sharp weapon against the aggressor and which, in harmony with the aspirations of peace-loving mankind, establishes an essential prerequisite for world peace and security.

49. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (*translated from French*): Since 1950, when the question of defining aggression was first raised in the General Assembly, my delegation has shown its will and desire to achieve such a definition. In 1950, it was in favour of referring the question to the International Law Commission for study and report to the General Assembly. At the sixth session of the General Assembly, in Paris, last year, my delegation again declared itself in favour of

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 9, chapter III.*

defining aggression. This year, too, it has taken part in the discussion of the question.

50. The Syrian delegation believes that a definition of aggression is not only useful but necessary. In spite of the arguments advanced with reference to the present international situation and the existence of tension in the international community, my delegation still considers that it is for the precise purpose of removing international tension that aggression must be defined. Indeed, if there were no such tension, a definition would perhaps be unnecessary. As a small country, Syria considers this definition especially necessary for the development of international law and international criminal jurisdiction.

51. My delegation regrets that certain delegations which, in the Sixth Committee, were in favour of establishing an international criminal jurisdiction, have not seen fit to vote in favour of a definition of aggression. They want to put the cart before the horse. Before setting up a judicial organ, it is essential to establish the code of law which that organ will be called upon to apply. That is why my delegation associated itself with all those who were in favour of defining aggression.

52. Opinions differed on this subject in the Sixth Committee. Some delegations, led by the USSR delegation, favoured an enumerative definition of aggression, while others advocated a synthetic definition. The Committee finally adopted a proposal instructing a committee of fifteen members to prepare a report for submission to the ninth session of the General Assembly. My delegation proposed an amendment to the effect that the committee's report should be submitted to the eighth rather than to the ninth session of the General Assembly, since we regard the definition of aggression as urgent. Since that amendment was rejected, my delegation this morning voted for the Polish amendment, proposing that the committee's report should be submitted to the eighth session.

53. Although that amendment was also rejected, my delegation voted for the draft resolution as submitted to us by the Sixth Committee, considering that it represents a step forward in the matter of defining aggression. We hope that the committee will succeed in its task and thus help to achieve the purposes for which it was established, the purposes enunciated in the Preamble and Articles of the Charter itself.

54. Mr. COCK (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which is found at the end of the report of the Sixth Committee, on the understanding that its purpose was that a special committee would make a study of all the factors involved, with a view to deciding whether or not such a definition was desirable for the maintenance of international peace. However, as I had the honour to state in the Sixth Committee, my country favours any action primarily aimed at the achievement of the purposes of the Charter.

55. Consequently, in voting for the draft resolution which has just been adopted, I wish to state that my country was guided by its fundamental concern for the purposes of the Charter, in particular that of securing peace throughout the world; that has been its position in this debate.

56. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): A committee has been set up to study the problem as a whole, and not merely the views of any one country.

57. I do not think that even the Powers which do not believe that a definition of aggression is useful, have ever stated that such a definition is impossible. The fact is that they are represented on the committee, in which, we hope, they will help to clarify the whole question. Neither those who are in favour of a definition—of a single definition—nor those who believe a definition to be impossible, have insisted that a definition must be arrived at or that complete agreement must be reached on the subject.

58. Our position has been conciliatory or, if you like, idealistic. It is not motivated, nor can it even be motivated, by political considerations.

59. Mr. LACHS (Poland): The problem of defining aggression was undoubtedly the major problem before the Sixth Committee. The effort to achieve a definition has long constituted, and still constitutes, one of the important chapters in the struggle for peace. For many years, it has been reflected in the search for a plan of disarmament and prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and in the efforts to implement systems of collective security.

60. It is to the great merit of the Soviet Union that, in connexion with the policy of peace which that country has conducted ever since 1917, it has unceasingly fought for a definition of aggression. Attempts in that direction which were made during the years between the wars were crowned with positive results. The Soviet Union definition of aggression, drawn up in 1933, has become part and parcel of positive international law and represents an important contribution to the theory and practice thereof. That definition of aggression has, in fact, withstood the test of time and history. That is why the new initiative which the Soviet Union has taken in the United Nations since the end of the Second World War, and which is aimed at confirming the 1933 definition, is fully justified in the fields of theoretical and practical international relations.

61. The best examples and proof what I have said were furnished during the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Assembly. The discussions during those sessions very clearly indicated that the majority of Member States wished such a definition to be drawn up. A considerable number of statements by delegations of various nations indicated that those delegations desired a definition binding on the United Nations to be established. They indicated that they desired the greatest crime in international law to be clearly defined.

62. We all know that the United Nations Charter prohibits aggressive war. Nations are fighting to secure peace and prevent aggression. What reason, therefore, can there be to object to defining the elements of this, the greatest crime in international relations? Those who desire peace, those who wish to live in peace, those who believe in the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of States having different political and economic structures, those who can envisage the possibilities of international co-operation—all those persons wish a definition of aggression to be drawn up; they recognize how necessary such a definition is.

63. That is why, as other representatives have already pointed out, the sixth session of the General Assembly adopted a resolution [599 (VI)] to the effect that a definition of aggression was both possible and desirable. Once that principle was laid down, the next step was to carry out the concrete provisions. That is why the Polish delegation maintained that it was possible to adopt a definition of aggression during this session of the General Assembly. There was every reason to take such action. We considered that the adoption of a definition of aggression on the basis of the concrete Soviet Union proposals was possible. We considered that such a decision would have constituted a serious step forward, a serious contribution to peace. The majority of delegations, however, while recognizing the desirability and possibility of a definition of aggression, expressed a desire that studies and work which would ultimately lead to the formulation of a definition should be continued.

64. In the light of this circumstance, the Polish delegation once again displayed a spirit of co-operation and joined with other delegations in voting to establish a special committee to undertake the task of preparing a definition. We should have preferred that the special committee undertake its task more quickly, in order that the General Assembly might consider its report at an earlier date. However, we voted in favour of the resolution as drafted, despite the fact that our amendment was not accepted and certain parts of the text caused us serious misgivings. As I have said, we do not fully agree with certain parts of the resolution. Nevertheless, we displayed a spirit of co-operation and voted for the text as a whole.

65. Unfortunately, however, not all delegations displayed this spirit of co-operation. Some members attempted to prevent the Assembly from undertaking any work in the desired direction. This applied in particular to some members of the Atlantic bloc. It must be stressed that those who do not want to hide behind nebulous formulae of existing law desire a definition of aggression and support all attempts to find it. This was the clear result of the discussion, and those who want to retain a free hand in international relations, and to be able to describe their various actions in such a way as to conceal their real aims, are opposed to a definition of aggression. That, as I say, emerged clearly from the debate.

66. The delegation of Poland, while voting in favour of the draft resolution establishing the new committee, wishes to emphasize that it will continue its fight for a definition, and that it considers the Soviet Union proposal for such a definition as the basis and guide for any further work. It wishes to emphasize, also, that it will continue to fight for a definition which will brand in the eyes of world opinion every act of illegality and crime constituting aggression.

67. In concluding, I wish to state that the delegation of Poland will continue its struggle for a definition which would constitute a directive for international organs called upon to act in concrete cases so that aggression might be more easily prevented and more forcefully repressed.

68. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers it necessary to ex-

plain its vote on the item under discussion. We have already had occasion to express our views in greater detail in the Sixth Committee, and I shall therefore be brief.

69. As we know, the question of defining aggression was first raised by the Soviet Union. We also know that the London conventions of 1933 concerning the definition of aggression were based on the proposals of the USSR. Those proposals were in accordance with the action taken by the Soviet Union to strengthen peace and security throughout the world. The convention on the definition of aggression could have become an important instrument for the maintenance of peace. However, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, whose policy even at that time was to encourage the aggressors, refused to sign the convention. Now also, the governments of those same countries are firmly opposing a definition of aggression. But the history of two world wars, the events of recent years and the present international situation show that the absence of a clear definition of aggression is of advantage only to the aggressors. To resist aggression, we must know what aggression is, and for that purpose an exact definition of aggression must be available. The Soviet Union has always and consistently striven to secure peace, to prevent war and to obtain a precise and clear definition of aggression in order to rule out the use of any pretext to justify it.

70. The Byelorussian people, one of the first to become a victim of Hitlerite aggression during the Second World War, had to endure inexpressible sorrow and suffering. The territory of Byelorussia was twice subjected to devastating attack. We know very well what war is and what are its consequences. The Byelorussian people, therefore, like many other peoples in the world who have lived through the horrors of the Second World War, want no repetition of it. Peoples who have borne the affliction of two world wars in a single generation cannot reconcile themselves to the idea that preparations for aggression should be tolerated or should go unpunished. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is therefore strongly in favour of defining aggression. If the United Nations really desires to combat the threat of a new world war, it has the duty, from both a moral and a political point of view, to define aggression.

71. The USSR draft resolution, which we discussed in detail in the Sixth Committee, is fully in accordance with these aims and objectives. It contains a list of all acts which should be regarded as acts of aggression. The inclusion of these distinguishing features of aggression in a definition of aggression is of particular importance for the strengthening of peace and international security.

72. The opponents of a definition of aggression, headed by the United States, absolutely deny the necessity and utility of a definition of aggression. They cover up their real aims with all kinds of hypocritical arguments to the effect that a definition of aggression might constitute a latent danger to the exercise of the right of self-defence, or that it might be exploited by aggressors and seriously complicate the work of the organs of the United Nations.

73. In fact, the argument that a definition of aggression is unnecessary is inseparably connected with the

plans of aggression of those who are preparing for another war. It is no coincidence that the most active opposition to a definition of aggression is displayed by the representatives of the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, headed by the United States, a country which also opposes the conclusion of a peace pact among the five great Powers, the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments and armed forces. Concealing their real intentions behind mendacious propaganda concerning a supposed threat from the Soviet Union, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Australia, Brazil and a number of other countries are trying to delay consideration of the matter and make it unnecessarily complicated by advancing completely unfounded arguments—such as the one that it is impossible to provide a complete definition of aggression—in order to prevent the adoption of the proposal regarding a definition of aggression. In fact, the opposition of the United States and its supporters to a definition of aggression is by no means due to the impossibility of providing a full definition, but to other reasons. It was no coincidence, therefore, that on 26 November 1952 the United States delegation submitted to the Sixth Committee [336th meeting] a motion for the adjournment of the debate, because, in the opinion of the United States, it was undesirable, at that time, to prepare a definition of aggression and to recommend its adoption. What could be clearer than that?

74. In spite of the fact that both at the sixth and at the present session of the General Assembly the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries have opposed the adoption of a definition of aggression, a majority of the delegations to the United Nations have acknowledged that the question of defining aggression, with a view to ensuring international peace and security, should be carefully considered. The representatives gathered here at the seventh session of the General Assembly should listen to the voices of the hundreds of millions of people in peace-loving countries who demand that effective action should be taken against the criminal plans of the inciters to a new war, and that the threat of a new war should be averted.

75. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has always attached great importance to the question of defining aggression, and for that reason it warmly supported the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation on this question, since that draft expressed the idea that it was vitally necessary to define aggression given the present international situation.

76. My delegation supported the Polish delegation's amendment to the draft resolution approved by the Sixth Committee, to the effect that the word "ninth" should be replaced by the word "eighth", in other words, that this matter should be considered, not at the ninth, but at the eighth session of the General Assembly. It is our opinion that so urgent and important a question should not be postponed for another two years.

77. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that certain parts of the preamble and of the operative part of the draft resolution on defining aggression which was approved by a majority of the Sixth Committee and just now adopted by the General Assembly are unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, it voted for the draft

resolution of the Sixth Committee as a whole, because its adoption, even in its present form, will be of great importance for the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world.

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: report of the Third Committee (A/2328)

[Agenda item 27]

Mrs. Harman (Israel), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2328).

78. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the two draft resolutions, A and B, arising out of this report.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

79. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The question of refugees and displaced persons has been regularly included in the agenda of all sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations since 1946. The United Nations has adopted many decisions on the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons to their countries of origin.

80. It must be remembered that the refugee problem would not exist at all if the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France had fulfilled their obligations under international agreements on the repatriation of all displaced persons.

81. The International Refugee Organization, and now the High Commissioner for Refugees, have ignored the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, which laid down that the main task in connexion with displaced persons was to encourage and assist in every possible way their earliest possible return to their country of origin. Instead of concerning itself with the repatriation of displaced persons, the International Refugee Organization in fact acted as a recruiting agency for resettling refugees and displaced persons in countries requiring cheap labour; it also helped to recruit spies and diversionists among refugees and displaced persons for use against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the peoples' democracies. All this has been proved time and again by actual examples submitted by the representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other countries, and it was confirmed once again during the discussion of the report of the High Commissioner for Refugees in the Third Committee.

82. The USSR delegation submitted to the Committee the first-hand evidence of USSR citizens who had returned to their country after working in nickel mines in Canada. The USSR delegation submitted Press reports on the fate of tens of thousands of displaced persons, including doctors, artists, musicians, and other specialists, who are not allowed to return to their countries and have been compelled to perform strenuous work as road labourers or agricultural workers. Facts were also adduced to prove that the High Commissioner's Office was a recruitment centre not only for

cheap labour, but also for agents to carry on espionage and diversionist activities in the territories of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

83. The financial basis for the training and recruitment of diversionists is provided by the so-called Mutual Security Act signed by the President of the United States on 10 October 1951. The Act provides for a special allocation of \$100 million for financing, as is stated in the Act, any persons residing in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, or Albania, or persons who have fled from these countries, either with a view to incorporating them in units of armed forces supporting the North Atlantic bloc, or for other purposes.

84. The United States authorities used the International Refugee Organization and are now using the High Commissioner as a screen. In the western zones of Germany and Austria, and in other places, the occupation forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France are still illegally and forcibly detaining tens of thousands of displaced persons who are Soviet citizens. The most outstandingly inhuman aspect of this is the arbitrary and compulsory detention of children who were forcibly taken from the Soviet Union to Germany by the hitlerites during the war and who are now in the United States occupation zone. The representatives of the United States occupation forces openly state that their authorities have no intention whatever of returning these children to their parents. As a result of the illegal measures taken by the United States authorities, contrary to the agreements that have been concluded, the children are still separated from their mothers and families. The United Kingdom authorities take a similar position with regard to the repatriation of Soviet children.

85. The USSR delegation strongly protests against the inhuman activities of the occupation forces of the United States and the United Kingdom, activities which are contrary to the generally accepted principles of international law and as a result of which Soviet children are still unable to join their mothers and families in the Soviet Union.

86. It was for these reasons that the USSR delegation voted against the draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee, which approve the work of the High Commissioner.

87. Mr. KOMZALA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation voted against draft resolutions A and B contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/2328), for the reasons which I shall enumerate.

88. Draft resolution A proposed by the Third Committee lays down that the main task for the settlement of the refugee question is the assimilation and integration of the refugees in the country of residence. The draft resolution thereby violates the principles of the only correct settlement of the problem of refugees and displaced persons, the principles which were declared by the General Assembly in its resolutions 8 (I) and 62 (I), namely, that these persons should be returned to their countries of origin or the countries of their latest residence. Draft resolutions A and B of the Third Committee encourage the International Refugee Organization and, latterly, the High Commis-

sioner's Office to engage in illegal activities which are not aimed at the repatriation of the refugees, but, on the contrary, place every possible obstacle in the way of their repatriation.

89. It is obvious from the report of the IRO (E/2211), that only 73,000 of the total of 1,619,000 refugees and displaced persons reported on by that organization were repatriated during the period of its activity. Paragraph 16 of the report shows that only 1,039 persons were repatriated in 1951. Such figures are the result of the deliberate policy of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, since the end of the Second World War. These Powers, acting through their occupation forces in Western Germany, have hindered and rendered impossible the repatriation and return of refugees and displaced persons, in contravention of international obligations and of resolutions of the first session of the General Assembly, for which they voted.

90. In the Third Committee, the Czechoslovak delegation gave examples showing that the Western occupation authorities, through the agency of the IRO, had forcibly detained and were still detaining Czechoslovak citizens who wished to return to their country, and were creating an atmosphere of terror and fear. In these activities, the IRO gave—and now the High Commissioner's Office is giving—effective help to the occupation authorities.

91. From the outset of its activities, the IRO, instead of trying to repatriate displaced persons and refugees, raised obstacles to their return and permitted and supported propaganda against States Members of the United Nations. It thus became in the first place a supplier of cheap labour and also a supplier of spies, diversionists and enemies, used by the Western occupation Powers, headed by the United States, for diversionist activities in the peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union. Camps for displaced persons and refugees organized by the IRO in Western Germany have been turned into recruiting centres for the armies of the United States and the other Western occupation authorities, in order that these persons may be used in the struggle against national liberation movements, especially in Asia and Africa, and against their own countries. The United States occupation authorities, supported by the IRO and now by the High Commissioner's Office, are recruiting refugees in Western Germany and forcing them to join various units whose objectives are terrorism, espionage and diversionism.

92. The United States Government has tried to legalize this wrongful use of refugees and displaced persons for purposes of terrorism, espionage and diversionism by passing a law known as the Mutual Security Act of 10 October 1951. The purpose of this Act is to finance the establishment of armed aggressive units from among "selected" refugees and displaced persons, who are to conduct criminal and diversionist activities in the USSR, Czechoslovakia and the other peoples' democracies. On returning from his tour of Western Germany, Mr. Armstrong, a member of Congress, again confirmed this fact when he reported on his investigation of conditions for the establishment of military units composed of refugees in Western Europe. Mr. Armstrong made the following statement: "The whole burden of my report this afternoon will be a plea that the time has come to utilize this great asset, which we

have in the refugees and escapees from the iron curtain countries of Eastern Europe. I make a plea that we establish an Army of Liberation from the available military personnel among those refugees and exiles . . . " This quotation is taken from the *Congressional Record* of 10 June 1952.

93. As part of this hostile policy against Czechoslovakia, the United States occupation authorities are detaining Czech children taken to Germany by the Nazis during the Second World War, and are still preventing their repatriation.

94. It is obvious from the facts I have adduced that the High Commissioner's activities are not directed towards humanitarian and social ends, but that they are on the contrary inhuman and have no connexion with the settlement of the refugee question. The High Commissioner's Office has become a link in the chain of preparation for a new war and a useful tool for the war-mongers. Instead of trying to give effective assistance to the refugees and displaced persons and helping them to return to their own countries, instead of co-operating effectively with the governments which are doing their best to bring about the repatriation of those persons, the High Commissioner's Office has become the agent of the States leagued together in the aggressive Atlantic pact and has started to set up foreign legions and to co-operate with the "CIC" organization.

95. The Czechoslovak delegation strongly objects to the activities of the High Commissioner. The chief objective of United Nations policy with regard to refugees should be their speedy repatriation. It is a crime against peace and against the interests of the majority of the refugees and displaced persons to prevent them from being repatriated, to keep them forcibly in the position of refugees and displaced persons and especially to take advantage of them for criminal ends, by forcing them to become traitors to their countries.

96. For these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation strongly objects to draft resolutions A and B and voted against them.

**Draft convention on political rights of women:
report of the Third Committee (A/2334)**
[Agenda item 61]

Mrs. Harman (Israel), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2334) and then spoke as follows:

97. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: There were sixteen women representatives on the Committee for consideration of this item, which was referred to it by the General Assembly.

98. Although there were differences of opinion as to the composition and formulation of the draft convention on the political rights of women, there was unanimous agreement on the principle recognizing the right of women to political equality with men.

99. This draft is the first legal instrument on behalf of women's rights to be brought before the General Assembly for its approval, and women throughout the world look eagerly to this Assembly for its adoption of the draft resolution [A/2334] before it, with its

annex containing the text of the draft convention on the political rights of women.

100. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation hopes that the majority of the delegations at this seventh session of the General Assembly will vote in favour of the draft convention on the political rights of women. In our opinion, by the adoption and signature of this instrument, the United Nations will help to bring to completion an act of basic human justice, namely, the extension of political rights to more than half the world's population, who are still, in some parts of the world, the victims of unpardonable discrimination by reason of their sex.

101. Moreover, we are confident that this event of transcending historical importance will serve as a stimulus to that small group of countries which have not yet granted political rights to women and that it will persuade them so to revise their legislation that the right to vote will become, for them as well, the legitimate heritage of both sexes.

102. We are also confident that the new States created under the auspices of the United Nations will not depart, in drafting their respective constitutions, from the standards established by such instruments as the United Nations Charter, which reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, and in the equal rights of men and women.

103. In that connexion, we wish to point out that we have noted with deep concern that, while the Constitution of the State of Libya does not establish discrimination on the basis of sex, its electoral law, adopted by the National Assembly, does deprive women of their rights by specifically stating that only men shall be entitled to vote and to be elected to office. We have also viewed with concern the unusual provision contained in article 20 of the Constitution of Eritrea, which states that only men shall have the right to vote. The situation is the more regrettable in view of the fact that, while the Third Committee was engaged in discussing the draft convention on the political rights of women and approving it by a majority vote, the General Assembly, which was considering [404th meeting] the report of the United Nations Commissioner in Eritrea [A/2188], tacitly approved the negative attitude of the new federal State, whose Constitution explicitly excludes women from the enjoyment of the rights acknowledged to be theirs by the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

104. Once the draft convention on the political rights of women is finally approved by the majority in this Assembly, we trust that it will not, like other instruments, be consigned to prolonged oblivion by the parliaments of the world, but that it will soon become a living reality which will justify the efforts of the Commission on the Status of Women and contribute to the extension of political rights to all women throughout the world who are now victims of unjustifiable discrimination by reason of their sex.

105. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America): The United States Government has consistently supported the draft convention which is before us for approval, and my delegation supported the draft in

the Third Committee. I should like, however, to explain certain aspects of the vote of my delegation in the General Assembly.

106. The United States delegation will support the amendment of France and Greece [A/L.140] to eliminate from the text of articles I and II what remains of the original Soviet Union amendment, namely, the phrase "without any discrimination". It does not support the Indonesian amendment [A/L.138] to add this phrase to article 3.

107. The Third Committee, in voting against the rest of the USSR amendment, clearly established that discrimination between men and women on political grounds would not be tolerated under the convention. Since, by the terms of articles I, II and III, as recommended by the Economic and Social Council, the provisions of the convention will benefit women on equal terms with men, the remaining language of the Soviet Union amendment adds nothing whatever to the benefits which this convention will accord to women throughout the world. This is so because the convention is intended to deal with discrimination against women as such, and the phrase "without any discrimination" means nothing more than that in no particular shall women be discriminated against as compared with men. The phrase does, however, add an element of confusion. It might take away from the benefits which the convention is intended to bestow. The appearance of the words in articles I and II and not in article III adds to this bad effect. In view of the fact that every treaty should be drafted as precisely as possible, it would be advisable to eliminate the phrase "without any discrimination" in articles I and II.

108. With regard to article III, the understanding of the United States delegation remains unchanged: first, that the phrase "public office" does not include military service, and secondly, that the "public functions" referred to in this draft convention are synonymous with "public office".

109. My delegation will vote for article VIII in the form in which it was approved by the Third Committee for the reasons so forcefully expressed in the Third Committee by the delegation of India. In our opinion, this article will prevent delay in extending equal suffrage to women in all territories.

110. The amendments proposed by the Soviet Union delegation were discussed in the Third Committee and were rejected as being restrictive and as possibly weakening the draft convention. The United States will vote against them in the General Assembly for the same reasons.

111. As I said at the outset of our discussion in committee, I believe this draft convention is significant for women in all countries because it highlights the responsibility of citizenship, which all women should undertake. I hope that within the next few years we shall find equal suffrage has been granted to women everywhere, including the two areas, Lybia and Eritrea, in which the United Nations has a special interest. I also hope that at the next session of the General Assembly, and at those to follow, we shall find the promise of this draft convention reflected in the increasing recognition of women in high posts in all governments and as representatives to the United Nations.

112. Miss MANAS (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): At the fourteenth session of the Economic and Social Council my delegation, supported by a number of other delegations, declared that, as drafted, submitted and approved, the draft convention on the political rights of women represents the quickest way to ensure that in all countries where women were not entitled to vote, they would be granted that right on an equal footing with men and in accordance with the preamble of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

113. At the sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women, my delegation voted in favour of the text of the draft convention without any of the amendments submitted at that time. We considered that articles I, II and III should be retained as they stood, because we felt that those articles, thus worded, ensured that women would enjoy the right to vote on the same footing as men. That was why we did not vote for any of the amendments proposed at the fourteenth session of the Economic and Social Council or, more recently, in the Third Committee, during the seventh session of the General Assembly. We are still in favour of the original text, since we have not changed our opinion. On various occasions my delegation has stated that it considers these three articles clear, precise and fair.

114. We now have before us the amendments submitted by the delegations of France and Greece (A/L.140) and by the delegation of Indonesia (A/L.138). My delegation has maintained the same point of view and the same position since the sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women. It will therefore vote in favour of the amendments submitted by the French and Greek delegations. If the second of these amendments is rejected, it will support the Indonesian amendment, because it considers that, if the phrase "without any discrimination" is included in articles I and II, it should also appear in article III in the interests of good drafting and consistency. Nevertheless, we do not think that it is absolutely essential to insert it.

115. Mrs. MARZUKI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation, in submitting an amendment [A/L.138] to article III of the draft convention on the political rights of women today, has tried to bring all three articles into harmony with each other and to eliminate the difference in wording between articles I and II, on the one hand, and article III, on the other hand. This difference in wording might give rise to a difference in interpretation which—and I would like to state this for the record—would not be in accordance with the understanding of my Government. It is the view of my Government that the addition of these words is not superfluous and does not contain a repetition, as has been said by some delegations. The Charter itself uses the words "without distinction" when it refers to the principles of equal human rights and fundamental freedoms.

116. Although we voted for the draft convention as a whole in the Third Committee, we were not entirely happy about the inconsistent wording of articles I, II and III. However, as the main reason for the rejection of our suggestion in the Third Committee was based on considerations of language rather than of

substance, we should like to appeal to the delegations which objected to it to reconsider their objections and to act in accordance with the spirit of the draft convention, and to accept our amendment which, in fact, not only harmonizes the language and wording of articles I, II and III, but also eliminates any discrimination in practice, bringing into accord the intentions of articles I and II, on the one hand, and of article III, on the other.

117. In view of these considerations, the Indonesian delegation will vote against the second amendment proposed by the delegations of France and Greece, since it might invite discrimination in the interpretation and application of articles II and III.

118. My delegation would like to request priority in voting so that the Indonesian amendment which was submitted first, may be put to the vote before the French and Greek amendments.

119. Mrs. KHOKHOL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The need for political and economic equality for women is stated in a number of United Nations documents—in the Preamble to its Chapter, in the resolution 56 (I) on the political rights of women adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 1946, and in many resolutions of the Economic and Social Council. Nevertheless, as the report [A/2154] of the United Nations Secretariat indicates, women are still denied all political rights in fifteen States Members of the United Nations. In the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other countries there is still a large measure of discrimination against women with regard to hours of work and equal pay for equal work, as well as racial discrimination and the like. In most of the colonial and dependent countries women are deprived of elementary political, economic and social rights. The discussion in the Third Committee on the draft convention on the political rights of women revealed that in many capitalist countries nothing has been done to end a state of affairs in which women enjoy no political rights, despite the fact that the equality of men and women is proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations as a fundamental principle.

120. It is quite obvious that the recommendations even of such an international body as the United Nations are insufficient of themselves to ensure for women equal rights with men. The appropriate obligations must also be assumed by States. The convention on the political rights of women, the draft of which is before the General Assembly for its approval, is designed to fulfil that purpose. At the present session, the General Assembly must adopt a convention on the political rights of women which will really help women in the capitalist countries to emerge from their present status of inequality.

121. Unfortunately, the draft convention as approved by the Third Committee, does not meet these requirements, since it contains no concrete obligations to be assumed by States parties to the convention to adopt all necessary measures, including legislative measures, to ensure for all women the genuine possibility of exercising the rights provided for in the relevant articles of the draft convention and does not bind States to extend the provisions of the convention to all territories, including Non-Self-Governing Territories, with the least possible delay.

122. In the Third Committee, the USSR delegation introduced a number of amendments and additions to the draft convention on the political rights of women. These amendments, however, although supported by many delegations, were rejected in committee by a very small majority. During the discussion on the USSR amendments in the Committee, the representatives of a number of countries alleged that the list of types of discrimination against women proposed by the USSR was incomplete. But when the representative of the Soviet Union declared that his delegation was prepared to discuss any additions to that list of criteria, the delegations concerned failed to submit any. They preferred to vote against any enumeration of criteria of discrimination. Owing to the rejection of the USSR amendments, the wisdom of which is quite evident, the draft convention lost its practical character and has thus become a mere declaration.

123. In an endeavour to ensure that the convention on political rights of women shall be an effective document, not only proclaiming rights but also imposing concrete obligations on States Members of the United Nations guaranteeing the application of those rights, the USSR delegation has reintroduced its amendments to the draft convention in the General Assembly for its consideration.

124. The USSR delegation has proposed the insertion, after the words "without any discrimination" at the end of article I, of the words "on the grounds of race, colour, national or social origin, property status, language or religion". It has proposed the same amendment to articles II and III of the draft convention. Without the inclusion of the USSR amendments, these articles would be incomplete and would thus fail to fulfil the purpose of ensuring political rights for all women without exception.

125. The USSR delegation has also submitted other amendments to article II of the draft convention, proposing that women should be eligible for election not only to local but also to central, State and public bodies. The reason for these amendments is that in certain cases women are eligible for election to local bodies only and are denied access to central bodies. In our view, such discrimination must be abolished.

126. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR further supports the USSR delegation's proposal for the addition of two articles to the draft convention on the political rights of women. One of these, article IV, reads as follows:

"The States Parties to the Convention undertake to adopt all necessary measures, including legislative measures, to ensure for all women the genuine possibility of exercising the rights provided for in the foregoing articles of this Convention."

The other, article V, states that

"The States Parties to the Convention undertake to extend the provisions of the present Convention to all the territories under their jurisdiction, including Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, with the least possible delay."

These articles emphasize the need for the practical application of the convention and therefore complete it in an important and substantive fashion.

127. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR also associates itself whole-heartedly with the other amendments to the draft convention on the political rights of women proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR firmly believes that the adoption by the General Assembly of the USSR amendments and additions will make the convention on the political rights of women a document which will be in the interest of many women who are still denied those rights in a number of countries; it will therefore vote for the amendments to the draft convention proposed by the USSR. If these amendments are adopted, it will also vote for the draft convention as a whole.

128. Mr. CASTILLO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): When I spoke in the general discussion on the draft convention on the political rights of women in the Third Committee, I expressed my delegation's pleasure in taking part in the discussion of a matter of such keen political and social interest to my country. As I said then, Ecuador is a staunch champion of the noble and just cause of feminism in our continent, as is shown by the facts which I shall now recall.

129. Ecuador was the first Latin-American country to grant women the vote. In advance of all the others, it granted women the right to vote in general elections as early as 1929, when constitutional provisions were introduced granting women equal political rights with men.

130. Ecuador was one of the four Latin-American countries which, in 1933, in Montevideo signed the first inter-American draft convention granting political rights to women.

131. It was one of the fourteen countries which signed the Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women adopted at the ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá on 2 May 1948. It was also the first country to ratify that convention.

132. In the Third Committee, my delegation voted for the present draft convention as a whole, which contains three basic articles; we stated at the beginning of the debate that, if need be, we should vigorously combat any modification of those articles. By the barest majority, a phrase was unfortunately added to the first two articles which, as I stated in explaining my vote, is incompatible with the laws in force in my country. My delegation cannot accept this additional phrase—"sin que se haga distinción alguna" [without any discrimination]—since, as I explained at the time, Ecuador draws a distinction between men and women in regard to the exercise of the vote, but a distinction in favour of women. For men the exercise of the vote is a right and a duty, whereas for women it is a right but not a duty, being optional.

133. Article 22 of the Ecuadorean Constitution at present in force clearly specifies that voting in popular elections is obligatory for men and optional for women. Under the law governing elections, men who fail to vote are liable to the loss of their employment and a monetary fine. Women who for some reason fail to exercise their vote are not liable to any penalty. There is therefore discrimination in the Ecuadorean law, but discrimination in favour of women.

134. As Ecuador is anxious to ratify the convention on the political rights of women without reservations, I would ask the President if, when he puts article I to the vote, he could put the final phrase, "without any discrimination", to the vote separately. My delegation would thus have an opportunity of voting against that phrase, which was added later to the original text of the draft convention. As I have said, my delegation voted for that draft convention as a whole, in accordance with the policy it advocates both nationally and internationally, namely, that women should be granted full exercise of the right to vote on equal terms with men, that they should be eligible for election to all elected public bodies and that they should be entitled to hold all public offices. If the draft convention on the political rights of women is adopted without the addition of this phrase to article I, I am perfectly confident that the President of the Republic of Ecuador, an outstanding democrat and an ardent feminist, will submit it to the next session of our legislative body, in 1953, for immediate ratification. Even if this addition is not deleted, I am confident that my country will sign and ratify the convention, but it would be obliged to record its reservations in regard to the first article in view of the constitutional difficulties I have explained.

135. Mrs. BASTID (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation has not been sparing in its support for the draft convention on the political rights of women. Its main reason for joining with the Greek delegation in submitting an amendment [A/L.140], is that the Assembly should fix a date for the ceremony of opening the convention for signature. That date should not be too soon, so that governments wishing to participate in the ceremony may be ready for it, but neither should it be too distant. The end of the seventh session, in the spring of 1953, should therefore be satisfactory.

136. Several delegations have noted the lack of harmony between the texts of the first three articles of the convention. Since the French delegation has always been in favour of the simplest and most general text, and since it is important also not to confuse the problem of equal rights for men and women with the separate and extremely wide question of discrimination—which will be dealt with in specific and appropriate provisions of the covenants on human rights—we propose that the Assembly should delete the words "without any discrimination" at the end of articles II and III, rather than add them to article III, as proposed by Indonesia [A/L.138]. This procedure would meet the general wish that the three articles should be consistent with one another and should be drafted on the same lines, and would also eliminate the problem of discrimination, a problem which in any case is implicit in the convention.

137. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The discussion on the draft convention on the political rights of women at the seventh session of the General Assembly is of great significance for millions of women throughout the world. In the Preamble to the United Nations Charter, the Member States declared their determination "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women". In accord-

ance with this declaration, the Commission on the Status of Women was established [*resolution 48 (IV) of the Economic and Social Council*] with the task of "promoting equal rights for women and eliminating discrimination on grounds of sex in the legal, political, economic, social and educational fields". Six years have passed but, to our regret, neither the Commission on the Status of Women nor the Economic and Social Council has fulfilled its tasks. The General Assembly was therefore compelled at its sixth session to recognize, in its resolution 532 A (VI), that the task of the Commission was not yet completed, "since the principle of equal rights for men and women has not yet achieved universal recognition, and that in many countries women have not yet been granted equal rights with men".

138. In fifteen countries, women still have no political rights whatever, in six countries they are permitted to take part only in elections to local bodies, and in three countries restrictions have been placed on their participation in political life which in practice deprive them of the opportunity to take part in political life. Thus in twenty-four countries women do not enjoy, even in theory, equal political rights with men. In those countries where in theory women enjoy equal political rights with men, the actual exercise of the rights proclaimed in the constitutions is not altogether satisfactory. The exercise of those rights is hindered by the existence of various laws and practices which discriminate against women. In many countries women are virtually excluded from participation in political life, and the fine promises of equal rights for men and women proclaimed in their constitutions have remained a dead letter in practice. In a number of southern states of the United States, women are deprived of electoral rights on grounds of race, colour, nationality or language. In the Trust Territories and colonies, women are deprived of elementary human rights, including even the right of inviolability of the person. They have no political, economic or social rights and no right to education. The metropolitan countries are endeavouring to perpetuate that state of affairs in those territories by exploiting the enslaved condition of the peoples of those territories and the low cultural and educational level of the population, in particular of women.

139. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR therefore considers that there are serious defects in the draft convention on the political rights of women submitted by the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its seventh session. The convention does not meet the purpose for which it was intended; when it was drafted, no concrete provision was made for granting political rights to women in a number of countries, among them States Members of the United Nations.

140. The USSR delegation submitted amendments and additions to the draft convention at the sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women and at the fourteenth session of the Economic and Social Council. These amendments and additions were designed to make of the draft convention a practical and effective document which would meet the vital interests of millions of women who were still deprived of all possibility of participating in the political life of their countries. These amendments, however, were rejected

by a mechanical majority. They were also rejected by the Third Committee at the seventh session of the General Assembly.

141. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the additions and amendments [*A/L.137*] to the draft convention again submitted by the USSR representative at the seventh session of the General Assembly. The draft convention would be considerably improved if the amendments and additions proposed by the USSR delegation were included in it, since they correspond to the vital interests of women in many countries and are designed to make the convention a more practical and effective document.

142. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers it entirely correct and, indeed, essential to include in the draft convention the following article proposed by the USSR: "The States Parties to the Convention undertake to adopt all necessary measures, including legislative measures, to ensure for all women the genuine possibility of exercising the rights provided for in the foregoing articles of this convention". Without the inclusion of this article, the convention will be inadequate and will be unable to promote the effective grant of political rights to women.

143. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR also considers it essential to include in the draft convention an article under which the States parties to the convention undertake to extend the provisions of the convention to all the territories under their jurisdiction, including Non-Self-Governing Territories, with the least possible delay. If this article is not included, the result will of course be that the convention will not be applicable to the colonies and Trust Territories, in other words, to millions of women deprived of their rights throughout the world.

144. In conclusion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR deems it necessary to emphasize the importance and timeliness of the USSR delegation's additions to all the articles of the draft convention, proposing that the convention should include a clearly expressed undertaking by States not to permit any discrimination on grounds of race, colour, national or social origin, property status, language or religion. The addition of this provision is essential because, as I have already pointed out, there is discrimination against women in many countries on precisely these grounds.

145. It is clear from all the foregoing considerations, therefore, that the additions and amendments proposed by the USSR representative correspond to the vital interests of millions of women who are still deprived of the possibility of participating in political and economic life on equal terms with men. The adoption of the USSR proposals would remove the serious defects of the draft convention and would make it more practical and effective.

146. For these reasons, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the additions and amendments proposed by the USSR and will vote for their adoption.

147. Mr. CHARLONE (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The Uruguayan delegation will be glad to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the draft convention on the political rights of women. I am happy to say that in my country the right to vote was granted to women twenty years ago and that, thanks to the

participation of women in the public life of Uruguay, my country possesses one of the most articulate electoral bodies. The population of Uruguay does not exceed 2,300,000, but the active electorate numbers one half that figure. That, of course, is due to the active participation of women in our public life.

148. We shall vote for this text as a whole, for we fail to see how the Spanish expression "sin distinción" [*without distinction*] can mean anything different from "sin discriminación" [*without discrimination*]. When we say in this convention that rights shall be granted to women without distinction, we mean, in Spanish that they are to be granted without discrimination—not merely without any discrimination on grounds of race or colour, as mentioned in some of the proposed amendments, but without discrimination based on many other considerations. For this reason, we believe that the sixth Committee, when it approved this convention, laid down the correct and broadest principle in confining itself to the statement that women should be granted rights without any discrimination.

149. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The Guatemalan delegation would like to explain how it will vote on this item. Most regretfully, we shall abstain from voting on the draft convention on the political rights of women, for reasons which I shall state later. I wish to make it absolutely clear that the Republic of Guatemala has always firmly believed in equality of political and civil rights for women and men. This principle is expressed in our Constitution of 1945, in which women are granted equal treatment, without discrimination on grounds of race, economic or social position or any other reason.

150. My country is a party to the inter-American conventions which confer equal civil and political rights on women. Nevertheless, the Guatemalan delegation is very sorry to have to inform the Assembly that it will abstain from voting on this draft convention on account of the colonial clause, in article VIII, which originated in an amendment sponsored by India; this clause contains a doctrine which is not only incorrect but even dangerous, since it implies that the word "State" is to mean only peoples and territories that the United Nations has placed under the trusteeship of certain Powers. As that idea is contrary to the clear and definite position of the Guatemalan delegation, we shall abstain in the vote, as I have said, despite our own national convictions.

151. Mr. KOMZALA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): My delegation abstained from voting in the Third Committee on the draft convention on the political rights of women contained in that committee's report (A/2334). This draft convention has a number of defects, which render it ineffective in practice. The Czechoslovak delegation indicated the three principal defects of the draft convention in the Third Committee.

152. In the first place, the draft convention imposes no obligations upon States which sign it and is therefore nothing more than a declaration. In its present form, the draft convention does not specify any practical measures—legislative or otherwise—which States must take in order to ensure effective equality of political rights for women.

153. Another important defect in the draft convention is the absence of any provision prohibiting discrimination. The absence of such a provision destroys the very basis of the idea underlying the convention. In its present form, the convention might easily be interpreted as guaranteeing equality between men and women of the same class or group only. This means that, as it stands, it is not directed to the attainment of equality among all people, without distinction as to sex, but to the attainment of theoretical equality between men and women of the same nation, the same social class, the same colour and race. In other words, it will not lead to universal equality without distinction as to sex, race, and so on, but merely to an equality between men and women in which distinctions of property, race, and so on, are retained. The fact that the Third Committee included the words "without any discrimination" in articles I and II does not remove this defect.

154. The third fundamental defect of the draft convention is the fact that it is not applicable to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. The position of women in many of those territories is akin to slavery. Domination by the monopolies and colonial oppression have resulted in the ruin and destitution of the indigenous population, which is kept on the verge of death from starvation. The colonial Powers in the Third Committee therefore did their utmost to prevent the inclusion in the convention of a provision extending its application to the colonies. They succeeded in securing the inclusion in the convention of article VIII, which enables the colonial Powers to avoid the application of the convention in Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories.

155. The Soviet Union put forward amendments in the Third Committee, which would have eliminated the fundamental defects in the draft convention on the political rights of women. These amendments were, however, rejected. The Third Committee is now proposing to the General Assembly a draft convention which has serious defects and cannot advance the struggle of women for the attainment of equality and full political rights without distinction as to race, colour, nationality, property, language or religion.

156. But what prevents the drafting of an effective convention on the political rights of women, when it is a generally recognized fact that there are at present millions of women, in the capitalist countries and in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, who are deprived of political, economic and social rights? Millions of women in the world are being deliberately kept in ignorance and have no opportunity of obtaining an education. They are paid much less than men for equal work, cannot hold public office and in some countries are still deprived of electoral rights. The discussions on the political rights of women which have taken place so far in United Nations organs have shown that some leading imperialist States still oppose any proposal for the real abolition of discrimination against women. Discrimination in all its forms—including, naturally, discrimination against women—is an integral part of the exploitation system, and exists not only in dependent territories but also in self-governing countries. Discrimination is one of the means of stirring up hatred among individuals and among nations to which imperialist States resort to maintain their power. It is

clear why the leading imperialist States oppose a convention on the political rights of women which would be binding, which would contain provisions prohibiting discrimination, and which would also apply to the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. They do so in the fear that such a convention might promote the democratic development of dependent countries towards self-determination and threaten their own colonial domination and the profits from their empires.

157. All the peace-loving peoples of the world desire and demand that all women without distinction shall have the same rights as men. A convention on the political rights of women could be of effective assistance in reaching that goal. But the draft convention in its present form is not aimed at securing the political rights of women.

158. The USSR amendments (A/L.137) make the draft convention on the political rights of women complete by providing that the convention shall help to ensure equal political rights for men and women, without any distinction. Consequently the Czechoslovak delegation, bearing in mind the interests of the women who are enslaved and discriminated against in capitalist countries and in Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, will vote for the USSR amendments.

159. Ato ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation participated in the debate and voted in favour of the draft convention on the political rights of women when the subject was discussed by the Third Committee, and will vote in favour of it today. Since, however, Ethiopia did not explain its vote in the Committee, it wishes to do so now.

160. Questions such as that of the political rights of women—their right to take part in their respective governments, to hold public office and to fulfil public functions on equal terms with men—are, we believe, intimately interconnected with the economic, social, cultural, historical and traditional factors which together form the characteristics of individual countries. These, however, are susceptible to change in the process of evolution in each country. But such changes must be systematic and gradual if national confusion is to be avoided.

161. Today the degree of political rights exercised by women differs in various countries, but that seems to me to be quite natural, taking into account the economic, social, cultural, traditional and other differences existing in these countries. There is no doubt that it is the desire of all of us to achieve a common standard, not only in the political field, but also in the fields of economy, education and social standards, whereby the peoples of the world, without any discrimination as to race, sex, colour, religion or nationality, will enjoy equal rights. I do not believe that there is any country in the world today which does not exert the utmost effort to attain this goal.

162. As far as Ethiopia is concerned, there is no legal discrimination against women in the exercise of their civic, political or economic rights. The tenure of public office and participation in the affairs of State are determined, not by sex, but by qualifications and merit. However, the affirmative vote which my delegation will cast on the draft convention on the political rights of women should not, in any way, imply that my

Government will thereby be pledged to sign the convention.

163. My delegation abstained, in the Third Committee, and will abstain today, from voting on article VII of the draft convention dealing with reservations, because reservations in a multilateral convention which have not been made at the time of the discussion and the signing of the convention, and have not been accepted by other parties, but are made at the time of ratification and accepted by some while rejected by other States parties to the convention, tend to destroy the value of the convention. My delegation does not subscribe fully to this principle. But since the General Assembly decided [*resolution 598 (VI)*] in favour of this principle at the sixth session, in Paris, last year, and until my Government takes a definite position in this regard, my delegation will be obliged to abstain on this article.

164. My delegation, in the Committee, voted against article IX, dealing with disputes which may arise between two or more States as a result of argument in the application of the provisions of the draft convention, because we believe that a right, such as the political rights of women, which is granted to individual citizens of a State by its own law, should not be a subject of international dispute.

165. Finally, in the Committee, we voted against article VIII, and we shall vote against it today, because that article maintains the so-called colonial clause, which denies the enjoyment of political rights by women in dependent territories. We believe this article to be unjust and in contradiction to many recent decisions reached by the Third Committee and by the General Assembly.

166. My delegation will, however, vote in favour of the draft convention as a whole.

167. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): My delegation will be glad to support the draft convention on the political rights of women, now before this Assembly, because we consider that it constitutes one of the most effective means of putting an end to one of the most disgraceful irregularities in the history of mankind: the lack of equality between men and women. The main reason why my delegation has taken part in the preparation of this convention in the various United Nations bodies, and will be happy to vote in its favour, is that this instrument is designed to remedy the situation and to establish once and for all complete equality between men and women.

168. There seems, however, to be some confusion in the minds of members of the Assembly as to the purpose of the convention. As we see it, the convention does not attempt to grant women all the rights they should have as human beings; it does not deal with all the rights to which men are entitled as such; it merely seeks to establish full equality between men and women in such a way that whatever rights are enjoyed by men in such and such a country shall be also enjoyed by the women in that country, under the same conditions—no more and no less.

169. The confusion arises from the fact that some delegations think that the convention should go beyond that original objective, and that in countries where, for reasons into which I need not go, men are them-

selves deprived of certain rights, women should be granted the very rights which, for reasons peculiar to those countries, are denied to men. We consider that such an extension of the convention is contrary to its intention, may defeat its original purpose and makes it less effective than if it were limited to its true aim—the establishment of complete equality between men and women.

170. With these reservations, we consider the text proposed by the Committee satisfactory. The wording of the first three articles ensures that women shall have, on equal terms with men, the rights mentioned in the convention.

171. The amendments [A/L.137] proposed by the USSR delegation with the intention, I have no doubt, of improving the text, do not seem appropriate to us. My delegation has always considered that the greatest contribution the Soviet Union ever made to the covenant on human rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was its constant insistence on non-discrimination. My delegation will bear witness, before history, to this contribution by the Soviet Union, which has always insisted on the principle of non-discrimination. My delegation has stuck to this principle through thick and thin and has defended it side by side with the USSR delegation.

172. In the text before us, however, the USSR amendment seems to us to distort the meaning and purpose of this convention, for it proposes the insertion, after the words "without any discrimination", in article I, concerning the enjoyment of rights on equal terms with men, of the words "on the grounds of race, colour, national or social origin, property status, language or religion". As we see it, the adoption of that text would mean that if, in certain countries, those rights were not granted to men, or to some categories of men, they would have to be granted to women. That ideal of perfection towards which the United Nations must strive will not and must not be achieved by this convention. It will be achieved by means of

another legal instrument, which is in process of preparation: the covenant on human rights, which establishes complete equality between men and women, granting them equality in the enjoyment of all rights to which man, as such, is entitled.

173. Even the watered-down formula adopted by the Third Committee, which states that women shall have certain rights "on equal terms with men, without any discrimination" does not seem very satisfactory, since fundamentally it alters the original meaning of the USSR amendment and robs it of all significance and value, even if that value is not needed in the text. If we say that women shall be entitled to vote, for example, on equal terms with men, without any discrimination, we mean without any discrimination between men and women; and the idea of eliminating discrimination based on race, colour, and the like, is no longer to be found in the amendment. To say that women shall be entitled to vote on equal terms with men, without any discrimination, can only be taken to mean without any discrimination between men and women. If we add: on the grounds of race, colour, and so forth, we introduce a new discrimination in favour of women and against men, in countries where men do not enjoy those rights.

174. For these reasons, the Lebanese delegation cannot accept the amendments which have been adopted by the Third Committee, and which may be proposed here, to the wording which was submitted to us by the Commission on the Status of Women.

175. For the same reasons, and so as not to establish another type of discrimination between different peoples in different territories, my delegation will be obliged to vote against article VIII, whereby a State may exclude certain territories from the application of this convention, since we consider that there is no justification for such discrimination.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.