



Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

AGENDA ITEMS 53 AND 60

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/8003, chap. IX, sect. A; A/8027, A/8057, A/8061 and Add.1, A/8062 and Add.1 and 2, A/8117, A/C.3/L.1765, A/C.3/L.1799-1801):

- (a) **International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) **Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (c) **Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, submitted under article 9 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;**
- (d) **Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General**

The importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (*continued*) (A/7998, A/C.3/L.1802)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*continued*)

1. Miss MAKOLO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that her delegation had not taken part in the general debate because the point of view of her Government with regard to discrimination had been repeatedly expressed before various organs of the United Nations. Her Government demonstrated its awareness of the humanitarian aspect of the problem by coming to the aid of the refugees who were victims of colonial domination or internal conflicts. It considered, moreover, that there was a need to adopt educational, social and other measures to put an end to the evil of discrimination and that a world campaign should be organized making systematic use of mass education programmes and information media to bring about the concrete elimination of racial discrimination.

2. With regard to the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee, her delegation noted that those in documents A/C.3/L.1799 and A/C.3/L.1800 differed only in their approach to the problem. It was tempted to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799 because it had a slight reservation concerning operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800: it would have great difficulty in "urging" its

own Government to ratify a convention which the Government was still studying and would accordingly have preferred the paragraph to be introduced by the words "hopes that" rather than "urges". Similarly, in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1801, as also in the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799, she thought that it would be more appropriate to use the term "notes with interest" because expressions such as "takes note with appreciation" had become polite formulas without much significance. She did not think that she could support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802 as it was worded at present.

3. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had taken part in the preparation of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800. As was stated in the second preambular paragraph of that draft, there was no doubt that racism and *apartheid* constituted a total negation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. In the third, fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs, the sponsors had taken account of the general concern of members at the fact that the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations in that field had had little or no effect, and also their concern at the arrogance of South Africa, which, not content with openly flouting the instruments and resolutions adopted by the United Nations, was ominously strengthening its military potential. In the sixth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 7 they had taken into consideration the fact that the Committee was aware that the measures taken by the United Kingdom against the illegal Government of Southern Rhodesia were insufficient and ineffective, and in the eighth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 6 they had also taken into account the fact that the majority of members condemned the neo-colonialist type of support which certain Powers were still affording to South Africa and the other racist régimes of southern Africa. Lastly, in the ninth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 8 they had wished to stress that the twenty-fifth anniversary marked a significant milestone in the life of the United Nations which should be, with the observance in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the occasion for making renewed efforts along those lines. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2 the sponsors had wished to emphasize that it was not the first time that the General Assembly was reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa to obtain racial equality and asking States to support the liberation movements.

4. One of the most important aspects of the draft was that the General Assembly would be called upon to declare that any State whose policy was based on racial discrimination contravened the principles of the Charter and therefore should not be a Member of the United Nations (operative

para. 4) and to condemn the alliance which existed between the various colonialist régimes of southern Africa (operative para. 3) and deplore the aid provided to them by certain other States (operative para. 5). Lastly, the sponsors had requested the dissemination of the study prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Mr. Hernán Santa Cruz, and the ratification by all States of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; they had also wished to establish a link between that question and the one previously examined by the Commission, asking all the progressive forces, especially the youth, to participate in the struggle against racism. They felt that they had taken account of all the views expressed in the Committee but they were ready to consider any suggestions with a view to securing unanimous support for the draft which they had submitted.

5. Mr. SANE (Senegal) noted that the delegation of the country primarily concerned, namely South Africa, had been absent from all the meetings devoted to consideration of items 53 and 60: that showed the contempt with which South Africa viewed the work of the United Nations.

6. He wished to make some comments concerning the ideas expressed by the representative of Portugal at the 1772nd meeting, for he was surprised that a member of a Christian church which preached the equality of all men should consent to become the defender of a retrogressive and discriminatory social system. He had never found in the works of Pascal and of Teilhard de Chardin the theories invoked by the representative of Portugal to defend the racist policy of his Government. Contrary to what the representative of Portugal had said, it was impossible to study the human personality without taking account of its social context, for man was the product of the collective conscience. While it was true that the granting of independence was not a panacea for all ills—and Portugal knew that well, for after centuries of independence it was still among the least developed of the Western countries—it was difficult to see how the subjugation of peoples under the false pretext that they were not ready for self-determination could be a remedy for racial discrimination. Independence was the precondition for seeking a solution to the problem of racial discrimination in a given country. Furthermore, the representative of Portugal did not seem to make the necessary distinction between the concept of race and that of caste or, originally, a family traditionally specializing in a given occupation. The representative of Portugal had said he rejected violence as a means of achieving self-determination, but it was difficult to see what other means he could propose. Senegal for its part had already advocated a solution, namely the formation of a Lusitanian-African-Brazilian community of sovereign and independent States analogous to the Commonwealth; if Portugal were to admit that its policy was a short-sighted one, it would realize that that was a realistic proposal.

7. Turning to consideration of the draft resolutions, he said that he could not accept the text in document A/C.3/L.1799. The representative of France had contended that the draft had no political colouring, but racism inevitably had a political aspect which must be taken into account, and his delegation's objection was precisely that a draft which did not even name the countries directly

responsible for the persistence of *apartheid* and racial discrimination was all too lacking in colour. On the other hand it considered that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800, introduced by Zambia, gave a more complete picture of the question by raising the true substantive problems involved.

8. Mr. SATHE (India) said that he had participated in the preparation of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 and could affirm that all its provisions had been carefully weighed so as to take into account every aspect of the problem and thus obtain unanimous support. The sponsors were aware that the Special Political Committee was dealing with *apartheid*, but the Committee too must honestly recognize the political implications of the problem of *apartheid*, and of racial discrimination in general, in order to find a solution. Furthermore, it could not be denied that, as the draft resolution clearly stated, *apartheid* constituted a crime against humanity: that fact had been amply demonstrated and it was difficult to understand why the so-called advanced countries opposed the use of the word "crime". In the operative part of the draft resolution the sponsors, after taking note of all the instruments adopted by the United Nations, were in essence asking the Governments concerned and those which indirectly supported them to give tangible evidence of their real determination to fight racial discrimination in 1971. For example, it would be most encouraging if the United States, contrary to what appeared to be its real intention, actually gave effect to the personal wishes expressed by its representative during the general debate. The President of the United States had reminded the General Assembly at its 1882nd plenary meeting, on 23 October 1970, that the two great world Powers could determine the fate of mankind, the issue of war and peace. The Soviet Union was prepared to do everything it could to eliminate racial discrimination; if the United States was genuinely resolved to do the same, it could take advantage of the present opportunity to work together with the Soviet Union to put an end to that crime forever. It was puzzling to be asked to be patient and realistic when thousands of people were being slaughtered with arms from the United States, the United Kingdom or other countries. In the present state of affairs no one could remain a passive spectator and that was why the sponsors of the draft resolution were asking all States to take action.

9. The draft resolution which had been introduced orally by the French representative (A/C.3/L.1799) was entirely inadequate and his delegation did not see how the teaching programme it mentioned could be carried out. All sterile and humiliating arguments regarding the different colours of people's skins must be abandoned; in India a dark skin was a sign of beauty, for all the deities were represented as being dark-skinned. What must be stressed, as it was in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800, was the urgency of taking concrete action.

10. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 were prepared to accept any constructive suggestion provided it did not weaken the text, for there could be no question of advising patience and "realism" when dealing with such flagrant crimes.

11. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802, every country could and must accept the principle of self-determination, which was embodied in the Charter of the United

Nations. The Indian Government had always supported that principle and had always been in the vanguard of the struggle against colonial domination. However, the draft resolution omitted certain points. For example, it had not stressed with sufficient clarity the fact that the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was an urgent question; there was no reference to the Lusaka Manifesto, in which fifty-three States had undertaken to support the struggle of the oppressed peoples; and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was not mentioned. Furthermore, operative paragraph 3 invited the colonial Governments to take the necessary steps in order to ascertain the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, preferably through a plebiscite. That part of the text was useless, since it was much too late to organize plebiscites and the colonial peoples must be liberated immediately. Therefore, the last part of operative paragraph 3, after the phrase "Charter of the United Nations", should be deleted. Finally, the draft should mention forms of semi-colonial domination, such as that which existed in Palestine.

12. He wondered why the Pakistan representative insisted on bringing up the question of the differences between India and Pakistan at every turn. The question of decolonization should not be used as an excuse to introduce at all costs the question of a plebiscite, a method which, in any case, was not reliable because the outcome could very easily be manipulated. Pakistan should realize that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802 was a text on which both India and Pakistan ought to be able to agree.

13. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, said that the Indian representative should confine his comments to the draft resolutions. His delegation understood quite well why the Indian representative might have difficulties with draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802 and it was prepared to discuss with him the changes he had suggested, either in private consultations or in the Committee. However, there were no grounds for suggesting that the draft resolution in question alluded to the differences between India and Pakistan.

14. Miss EDMONDS (United States of America), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said it was regrettable that the Indian representative had tried to dissociate her, presumably because of her colour, from her official capacity and from the Government which she represented and whose views she expressed. She categorically rejected that racist approach. Furthermore, at a previous meeting the Syrian representative had called her "sister"; she could accept that term if it had been intended to express the concept of universal brotherhood, but not if it had been uttered in the spirit in which it was used by a certain black group, to which she did not belong.

15. Mr. SATHE (India), replying to the representative of Pakistan, said that his remarks had been relevant to the question before the Committee. He had spoken of expediting the granting of independence, not of the differences between India and Pakistan, and in doing so he had wished only to ensure the largest possible measure of agreement on the draft resolution.

16. He did not understand why the United States representative should think that in referring to her he had had in

mind her colour, for he had never questioned the fact that she represented her Government. He hoped that the wishes she had expressed would be given effect without delay by the United States Government.

17. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that, during the anniversary year, other United Nations bodies had already adopted several resolutions relating to the question of the elimination of racial discrimination, and said that, since they had studied it, he felt that the Third Committee should adopt only one resolution on the matter. The Committee's resolution should contribute to the achievement of a real solution to the problem of the elimination of racial discrimination and help mobilize the maximum effort on the part of all Governments and organizations concerned. On the other hand, it would be advisable to adopt a separate resolution on the question of the importance of the universal realization of the rights of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence.

18. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 could provide a basis for wide agreement in the Committee. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799, he said that the text did not correspond to the title: it was less concerned with the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination—indeed, it did not include the slightest mention of the programme contemplated for 1971—than it was with the general question of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The Committee therefore had before it two different draft resolutions dealing with the same question. His delegation preferred the text proposed in document A/C.3/L.1800, which included certain fundamental elements relating to the means that should be used to liquidate racial discrimination effectively. The French delegation and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799 had made great efforts to draft a text that would be acceptable to the largest possible number of delegations, but they had gone so far in that direction that they had left nothing that could either offend or interest anyone. Some of the sponsors of the draft were countries that supported the racist régimes and he would hardly be surprised if the text proved acceptable to the Government of South Africa itself. The draft failed to cover some important points which ought to figure in the draft resolution ultimately adopted by the Third Committee, i.e. the process of liberation of peoples, the establishment of justice and equality for all peoples, irrespective of their colour and creed, and the need to find a final solution in the very near future. The sponsors of both drafts might perhaps be willing to reach agreement so that the Committee need not adopt separate resolutions on the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and on racial discrimination; the words "to make renewed efforts and to take effective measures to this end" in operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 could be replaced by some such wording as "to implement to the fullest possible extent the programme proposed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2544 (XXIV) and contained in document A/C.3/L.1765". That programme was divided into several sections according to whether the activities envisaged were to be undertaken by United Nations organs, the Secretary-General, Governments, the specialized agencies or other national and international organizations.

It was extremely detailed and envisaged every possible measure to ensure truly effective action. If that amendment was accepted, it would not be necessary to adopt a separate draft resolution on the International Year.

19. With regard to the Finnish draft (A/C.3/L.1801), he had no objection to the substance, but thought that it would be better not to adopt too many resolutions, in order to avoid weakening the impact of the texts adopted, especially as it was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 could perhaps incorporate in its preamble operative paragraph 2 of the Finnish draft, so that the Committee would have only one draft resolution before it.

20. His delegation would endorse any suggestion designed to strengthen the resolution ultimately adopted by the Committee and to make it worthy of the twenty-fifth anniversary. It would express its views on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802 at a later stage.

21. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone), whose delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800, said that the draft fully reflected his delegation's position. His delegation was, however, consulting with the other sponsors in order to perfect the draft.

22. The draft resolution had been described as containing some elements—such as the question of Southern Rhodesia and the question of colonialism in general—which were more suitable for consideration by the Fourth Committee or the Special Political Committee. However, the sponsors considered that all those problems were interconnected and could not be dealt with separately. For instance, racism had its origins in colonialism. Those who were remote from such problems were quick to condemn racism but slow to go further than that. It was the duty of the people directly concerned to awaken the conscience of their fellows: that explained why the draft resolution contained certain elements which the representative of France, for example, considered irrelevant. The sponsors were tired of vague condemnations of *apartheid* and wanted action. They were ready to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799 in working out a single text, provided that that did not weaken the text of the resolution.

23. Some elements in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1799 were very positive, especially operative paragraph 2, by which the Assembly would appeal to the Governments of countries where forms of racial discrimination still persisted to take without delay all legislative, educational and social measures necessary to end them. Unfortunately, experience showed that that sort of appeal was received with contempt by the Governments to which it was addressed, such as those of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. However, there was a tendency to dwell solely on the most flagrant forms of racial discrimination such as those which existed in southern Africa, when more subtle forms of discrimination still persisted in many parts of the world in, for instance, the fields of employment and housing; Governments should ensure that legislation was adopted to put an end to all discrimination, even if law-making did not in itself guarantee an immediate change in the attitudes of individuals.

24. His delegation's views were reflected in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1802, but it would like to consult the sponsors about the introduction of a minor amendment. It was prepared to vote for the Finnish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1801) which corresponded to its own position.

25. Mr. NAMUTABO (Zambia) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1800 were fully aware that it was far from perfect. He announced that an informal meeting would be held in the afternoon to enable delegations wishing to improve the draft resolution to talk with the sponsors for the purpose of preparing a revised text that would meet with general approval.

26. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Portugal), replying to the comments of the representative of Senegal, said he maintained his view that the individual and society were two separate concepts. He observed that in his statement of the preceding day he had not quoted from the writings of Teilhard de Chardin but had merely referred to the philosopher by name. The representative of Morocco had said that the Charter was the most important document of the United Nations; he was quite willing to agree with that assertion, and indeed had concluded his own statement with a quotation from Article 76 of the Charter. Contrary to what the Senegalese representative had said, he had not confused the idea of caste with that of race. As no exact scientific definition of race existed, he had taken a hypothetical one. He did not think that every statement should begin with a minute definition of every concept mentioned. Still replying to the representative of Senegal, he said that his avoidance of political subjects had been intentional, since the Third Committee was concerned with social and humanitarian questions. Finally, he thanked that representative warmly for acknowledging that political independence was not a universal panacea.

27. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria), replying to the United States representative, observed that the Charter began with the words "We the Peoples of the United Nations . . ."; the Charter thus placed peoples above political systems. In using the word "sister" to address the representative of the United States, he had been thinking of her as a member of the universal family, thus demonstrating that individuals could speak on behalf of their Governments, without for all that repudiating their ties to the great human family. He acknowledged that the fact that the United States representative was black had perhaps influenced him unwittingly in his choice of words.

28. Miss EDMONDS (United States of America) said that she accepted the term as meaning a member of the universal family.

29. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) observed that the only dialogue possible between Portugal and Morocco on questions of discrimination and decolonization was a dialogue of the deaf. It was to be hoped, however, that the peoples of Mozambique and Angola would not have to show their wounds to the representative of Portugal in order that, like St. Thomas, he might finally be convinced.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.