United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-SECOND SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 1523rd MEETING

Wednesday, 22 November 1967, at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 50

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (concluded):

(a) Report of the High Commissioner (concluded) (A/6711);

(b) Question of the continuation of the office of the High Commissioner (A/6703 and Corr.1 chap. XIV, sect. I; A/6711 and Add.1; A/6801; A/C.3/L.1493/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1494/Rev.1)

1. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) said that whe had asked for the floor to explain her vote at the previous meeting and wished, first of all, to associate herself with the delegations which had warmly congratulated the High Commissioner for Refugees on his brilliant statement and his unselfish work for refugees. She had greatly appreciated the honour that the High Commissioner had done her in reporting (A/6711 paras. 107-113) the efforts of her Government to solve the problems caused by the influx of refugees into its territory. Her country, which had been one of the first African countries to ratify the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and which had also adhered to the Protocol to that Convention, had adopted various measures with a view to finding humanitarian solutions to the problems of the Sudanese and Congolese refugees.

2. It was, therefore, logical that her delegation should attach great importance to the continuation of the Office of the High Commissioner, and it was for those reasons that she had firmly supported the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1493/Rev.1), and the amendment submitted by the representative of Uganda (A/C.3/L.1494/Rev.1).

AGENDA ITEM 60

Question of the punishment of war criminals and of persons who have committed crimes against humanity (continued)* (A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. VIII; A/6813, E/4322, chap. III; E/CN.4/928)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)*

3. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKRTOVA (Czechoslovakia) wished to comment on some legal aspects of the topic under consideration, with particular reference to the principle of nullum crimen sine lege, which had been mentioned by various delegations. Throughout most of the history of international law it had been customary to describe certain crimes, such as piracy, the slave trade, traffic in narcotics and traffic in women and children, as "crimes against the law of nations". In modern times international law had also recognized various types of war crimes and to the crimes of perfidy, especially espionage and treason in time of war, which had already been recognized in the eighteenth century, many other categories of offences had been added under The Hague and Geneva Conventions and other general treaties. In 1919 the question of the responsibility of those who had started the war and the enforcement of penalties had been given particular consideration. The Treaty of Versailles had made provision for the international trial of the former Head of State of Germany and the surrender by Germany of other persons for trial by the military tribunals of the Allied Powers. Those provisions, although they had not been satisfactorily implemented constituted an important source of international law relating to the topic being considered by the Committee. The outrages perpetrated by the Nazis during the Second World War had made the punishment of war criminals and of persons who had committed crimes against humanity an issue of primary importance. Almost from the beginning of the war the Allied Governments and statesmen had solemnly and repeatedly declared their intention to bring war criminals to justice. A meeting held in London on the initiative of the Governments-in-Exile of Poland and her country had led to the Declaration of 13 January 1942, in which the representatives of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland and Yugoslavia had proclaimed that the punishment of those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity was one of the main aims of their war effort. Responding to that Declaration, the USSR Government had reiterated its strong warning to the Nazis occupying foreign territory and had stressed its conviction that the

*Resumed from the 1518th meeting.

perpetrators of war crimes and crimes against humanity must be severely punished. In the Declaration of 17 December 1942, which had been proclaimed simultaneously in London, Moscow and Washington, the Governments of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia had repeated their determination to punish nazi war crimes and crimes against humanity. The London International Assembly, created in 1941 under the auspices of the League of Nations, had affirmed in its conclusions on 21 June 1943 the personal responsibility of the nazis for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Those activities had culminated in the adoption of the Moscow Declaration of 1943 and the Agreement for the establishment of an International Military Tribunal, signed in London in 1945. All that proved beyond any doubt that the criminality of war crimes and crimes against humanity and personal responsibility for them had already been generally recognized principles of international law before they had been committed. Consequently, it was obvious that the principle of nullum crimen sine lege had been fully observed by the charter of the Nürnberg Military Tribunal. The London Agreement and the establishment of the Nürnberg Military Tribunal had represented a development of international law based on already existing principles.

4. Replying to the arguments of the delegations which had questioned the non-applicability of statutory limitation to war crimes and crimes against humanity, she stated that international law did not recognize any statutory limitation of rights and duties derived from its principles. It followed from the very nature of war crimes and crimes against humanity that no statutory limitation was applicable to them. Even the Treaty of Versailles, article 228 of which exempted crimes of war from national jurisdiction, ipso facto made statutory limitation inapplicable.

5. There was no justification whatever for the measures adopted in the Federal Republic of Germany, according to which statutory limitation would be applied to war crimes and crimes against humanity as from 31 December 1969. On the contrary, the country where most war criminals had found refuge should be among the first to apply the principles of international law relating to their punishment. Consequently, those measures constituted a violation of international law, the gravity of which was underlined by the fact that that country's own Constitution expressly provided that the general principles of international law took precedence over national law.

6. Mr. MARRACHE (Syria) thought it obvious that the preliminary draft (E/CN.4/928) before the Committee confined itself to the legal provisions which were necessary and sufficient to ensure the non-applicability of statutory limitation to the crimes already provided for and defined in earlier texts. His delegation, which supported the preliminary draft as a whole, nevertheless wished to make comments on certain points which it considered important.

7. As the title, the preamble and article I showed, the draft was meant to enumerate all war crimes and crimes against humanity, not only those provided for in earlier legal texts. Article I referred to the Charter of the International Tribunal of Nürnberg and to two General Assembly resolutions. The wording of that article showed an unduly restrictive intention. He would prefer the enumeration and definition of the crimes without any historical reference, and consequently without any mention of the original texts.

8. As far as the definition of the crimes was concerned, he found the enumeration in article 6, paragraph (b), of the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal generally satisfactory, but thought that in the phrase "wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages" the word "wanton" should be deleted, since it was obviously intended to mean "for reasons unconnected with military action" and that idea was already expressed in the text, which went on to say "not justified by military necessity". It was also obvious that no military necessity could justify murder, the killing of hostages or plunder, which were mentioned in the same paragraph. Therefore it was necessary to define the scope of the reference to military necessity. On the other hand, the enumeration of the crimes against humanity, taken over from article 6, paragraph (c), of the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal, was quite unacceptable for the following reasons: first, it connected those crimes with the crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal and considered them solely in relation to the crimes of the Second World War; secondly, it only took into consideration crimes committed in connexion with the War, whereas it ought to refer to all crimes against humanity, whether they were committed to time of war or in time of peace; and thirdly, it was incomplete, since it ought to include, like the enumeration of war crimes, the plunder of public or private property, the destruction of cities, towns or villages and genocide.

9. His delegation would prefer to limit article I to that important enumeration and to leave the question of the non-applicability of statutory limitation to article II. The reference in article I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 for the protection of war victims for the purpose of determining the gravity of the crimes under consideration seemed acceptable to him, but he did not find the wording sufficiently clear. It might perhaps be better to deal with the gravity of the crimes in a separate article.

10. It was essential that the convention of which a preliminary draft was under consideration should punish all war crimes and crimes against humanity, irrespective of who was responsible and who the victims were, and irrespective of the date or place of commission, without any restriction on account of earlier texts and, furthermore, whatever the political motive or the political context in which the crimes were committed. The crimes of colonialism, imperialism and racism should be punished in the same way as the crimes of nazism. Similarly, the preliminary draft of the convention should refer explicitly to the evil political tendencies which engendered war crimes and crimes against humanity.

11. No war crime or crime against humanity should be left outside the legal scope of the preliminary draft convention. Such crimes had been and were

now being committed against the Syrian people. They included violations of the laws and conventions of war, in particular the use of napalm, which had inflicted horrible burns on Syrian soldiers and peasants during the recent military operations, the murder and deportation of civilians, the pillaging of public and private property, the destruction of towns and villages and other inhuman acts of terrorism, and they should feature in the list in article I. They were crimes which had characterized the history of Israel and ranged from the expulsion and genocide of the Palestine Arabs to the butchery which had time and again steeped the region in blood.

12. In view of the foregoing, it might be preferable to give the draft convention a more general title covering a less restricted area than the non-applicability of statutory limitations. He was sure, however, that despite its specific character, the draft convention was in line with the desires of the international community and suggested that it might be useful to stipulate that the convention would be open to revision before the time-limit of ten years laid down in article IX, thus making it possible to terminate the Organization's legislative work in that field at an earlier date. In conclusion, he expressed his delegation's support of the non-applicability of statutory limitation to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and for the principle that non-applicability should be retroactive.

13. Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) said that two features of the preliminary draft convention—the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity, irrespective of the date of commission, and the obligation imposed on contracting parties to prosecute and punish war criminals, irrespective of the date of their offences—presented considerable difficulty to some delegations, especially as reservations were not allowed. On the other hand, since the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the Geneva Conventions of 1949 constituted a very comprehensive body of international legislation for the future protection of victims of war crimes, it was clear that the essential point of the present discussion was to decide whether statutory limitations should apply to war crimes and crimes against humanity committed during the Second World War. In that connexion, some delegations had argued that the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes was already an accepted and peremptory principle of international law. However, the debates in the Commission on Human Rights and in the Third Committee had established beyond doubt that the principle was nowhere near general acceptance, and that it could not be easily harmonized with national laws embodying the principle of non-retroactivity. In particular, it would involve complicated problems in newly independent countries like Jamaica if they were asked to legislate retroactively in respect of offences arising before their existence as sovereign States.

14. It could be that the attitude of Greece, in respect both of amnesty granted to war criminals and of its proposed amendment (see E/4322, para. 155) to the preliminary draft convention, could make a contribution to modern international law. Even though the Greek proposal would restrict the application of the convention, it offered a realistic solution which warranted consideration.

15. Although it was true that many war criminals had still to be tried, it was equally true that justice delayed was justice denied: it was important that justice should not only be done, but should also be seen to be done. His delegation accordingly took the view that the best way of bringing war criminals to justice would be to direct attention to the conclusion of a multilateral convention on their extradition, which would present less difficulties than the draft convention under consideration. It therefore hoped that the Joint Working Group would give thought to that aspect of the matter, whether as an alternative to the conclusion of the draft convention or as an integral part of it.

16. Miss MENESES (Venezuela) said that although her country had in the past supported the action taken to ensure that none of the war crimes committed during the Second World War should remain unpunished, some of the principles set out in the preliminary draft convention were difficult to reconcile with many national laws and that while she understood the motives of the delegations which had, with great sincerity, raised the question, she doubted whether the line followed was the one best fitted for the purpose of arriving at a text acceptable to the majority of delegations—a purpose for which both the preliminary draft convention and the Secretary-General's study on the matter (E/CN.4/906) were valuable basic elements.

17. After referring to the background to the question, she said that the draft contained two points, the non-applicability of statutory limitations to criminal proceedings and the retroactivity of the law, which gave rise to difficulties in the legal system of her country. Under Venezuelan criminal law, which provided for statutory limitation as a means of ending liability to criminal proceedings and penalties, it would be impossible to exclude certain crimes or offences from the statutory limitation. Furthermore, since war crimes and crimes against humanity were not covered by Venezuelan law, the Venezuelan Government had expressed the view, recapitulated in the Secretary-General's study, that the principle of statutory limitation could only be introduced into international law in the form of a convention.

18. The retroactivity aspect presented more serious problems for her delegation, since the Venezuelan Constitution expressly forbade the retroactive application of a law except in cases where it was to the defendant's advantage. The Constitution also stipulated that no one could be condemned to penalties which had not been established by an existing law, thus completing the set of legal provisions which would make it impossible for a war crime committed before the date when her country had signed the convention to be judged a posteriori.

19. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) attached great importance to the study of the question under discussion and to the adoption of a convention during the current session of the General Assembly. In the Moscow Declaration of 1943, drawn up by the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States, the punishment of war criminals had already been established as one of the aims of the allied war effort. That aim was reaffirmed in the Yalta Declaration and the Potsdam Agreements, and found expression in the Charter of the Nürnberg International Military Tribunal. The General Assembly had also confirmed the international responsibility of those guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity. It was therefore a recognized principle of international law that that type of crime could not be judged according to national laws, which were applicable only in so far as they were not contrary to the provision of international law. That explained the world-wide indignation at the decision taken by the Federal Republic of Germany to apply the statutory limitations to war crimes and the fact that the Polish delegation had decided to propose that the subject be studied, with a view to the adoption of an international convention which clearly confirmed the non-applicability of the statutory limitations to that category of crime.

20. Although her delegation considered that the Secretary-General's preliminary draft (E/CN.4/928) could serve as a basis for the Committee's work, it was not in agreement with the first part of article I, which limited the non-applicability of the statutory limitations to crimes of a grave nature, as that could lead to conflicting interpretations. Furthermore, since the General Assembly, in resolutions 2184 (XXI) and 2202 (XXI) respectively, had denounced the policy of the Portuguese Government in its African territories and the South African Government's apartheid policy as crimes against humanity, both types of crime should be included in the second part of article I. Meanwhile, in line with the principle of the sovereign equality of all States, there should be no limitation of the right to accede to the convention.

21. With regard to the exclusion of reservations, she agreed with the observations made by other representatives in that connexion and supported the Secretary-General's view that no denunciation clause should be included. Finally, she considered that the Greek proposal was at odds with the spirit and letter of the draft convention, and was therefore unacceptable.

22. Mr. SY SAVANE (Guinea) stressed the importance attached by his delegation to the subject under discussion, for the vile crimes perpetrated by the nazi régime made it incumbent upon mankind, as its sacred duty, to punish the guilty parties; the only way to do so was to confirm the non-applicability of the statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity, as defined in article 6, paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal, to which the contemporary forms of racism should be added.

23. His delegation was convinced that the adoption of an international convention on the subject under consideration would represent a decisive advance in the world-wide struggle against crime and all forms of human degradation, and it felt that the preliminary draft and study prepared by the Secretary-General should provide the basis for the Committee's work.

24. Some delegations had invoked their domestic legislation in opposing the non-applicability of statutory limitation to the crimes in question; however, those objections did not hold good at the international level, where the only sources of law were treaties, custom and certain subsidiary sources. In the matter of the punishment of war criminals and of persons who had committed crimes against humanity, there were international conventions such as the Moscow Declaration, the Potsdam Agreements and the London Agreement on 8 August 1945 which indicated clearly that the course adopted in that regard must lead directly to the non-applicability of statutory limitation to such crimes, particularly in view of the reappearance in Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, South Africa and Viet-Nam of the practices employed by the Nazis.

25. He felt that crimes of lesser gravity should not have been excluded in article I (a), since that limitation could, in certain cases, greatly weaken the application of the text. He fully supported articles II and III but thought that articles IV and VIII should be revised so that, firstly, the convention would be open to accession by all States without exception and, secondly, the convention would be protected against any reservation relating to the substantive articles.

26. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he agreed with previous speakers that the background of the subject under consideration was well known. The war unleashed by the Hitlerite fascist hordes had left a deep scar on humanity, and its effects were still felt. Like many other countries, Tanzania had contributed to the world-wide struggle in defence of freedom against fascist terror and destruction, and, in view of the gravity of the crimes committed by the Hitlerite régime, it felt that every possible effort must be made to bring to justice those who were responsible. It was gratifying to note, in that connexion, that there was little disagreement in the Committee concerning the need to punish war criminals and persons who had committed crimes against humanity.

27. Crimes of the type now under consideration were timeless in their nature and should not be subject to statutory limitation. He thus agreed with the Polish representative that domestic law could not provide for the application of statutory limitation to the prosecution and punishment of war criminals. Despite its general orientation, the preliminary draft convention (E/CN.4/928) was limited in scope and backward-looking. He agreed that the precedents established by the Nürnberg Tribunal should be given permanence; they should, however, be regarded as sui generis. The international situation had changed to the extent that it was necessary to create basic instrument to complement existing legal principles, since there were certain phenomena, such as the situation in South-East Asia, which had to be taken into consideration.

28. Some delegations had said that the debate on the present subject should be devoid of emotion. However, that was not possible, since the crimes committed by the fascists were very much a part of the present. The crimes against humanity now being committed

by the régime in South Africa, the white racist minority in Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonialists in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea aroused the indignation of those who loved freedom and were a continuation of the crimes committed by the Nazis. However, to attempt to equate the policies of apartheid with the criminal activities of the fascists was not what was important, since those policies and, in general, the colonialist policy still pursued in Africa were criminal in and of themselves. The question was what legal code should apply to those crimes against humanity. In its resolutions 2184 (XXI) and 2202 (XXI), the General Assembly had expressly condemned, as crimes against humanity, the policies of apartheid and the violations of the economic and political rights of indigenous populations. The international community must therefore take all necessary measures to ensure that justice was done. His delegation felt that it was the duty of mankind to oppose vigorously and take effective action against the subjugation of man, the denial of liberty and the destruction of human beings and material resources. It therefore contended that statutory limitation must not be applied to crimes against humanity of the kind that were occurring at the present time and that that principle must be reflected in any instrument designed to bring to justice persons who committed such crimes. His delegation was prepared to offer all necessary co-operation in drafting a convention that would safeguard the highest interests of mankind through the acceptance and application of legal instruments and the attainment of justice.

29. Mrs. REGENT-LECHOWICZ (Poland) said that while her delegation recognized the principle of non-retroactivity in the case of certain common crimes, it did not believe that that principle could be applied to war crimes and crimes against humanity. That position was, it should be added, in keeping with the principles embodied in article 15 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Certain delegations had cited paragraph 1 of that article in taking the opposite view; however, they had deliberately refrained from mentioning paragraph 2, which provided for trial and punishment in the case of any act or omission which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the general principles of law recognized by the community of nations. The war crimes and crimes against humanity had been recognized as such at the time when they had been committed. The existence of a state of war could have made them legal only if war itself was legal; since the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, however, war was no longer legal and the acts in question were therefore criminal.

30. There were a number of international instruments, such as the 1942 London Declaration, the 1943 Moscow Declaration and the 1945 Potsdam Agreements, which did not provide for any time-limit in the punishment of criminals; the application of statutory limitation in criminal cases was an institution which had until now been recognized only in domestic law—and, indeed, only in certain countries. The failure of the relevant international instruments to mention the applicability of statutory limitation which they contained.

31. One delegation had tried to convince the Committee that the preliminary draft convention was in conflict with the right of asylum; however, the fact that no such conflict existed was demonstrated by the provisions of article 1, paragraph 2, of the Declaration of Territorial Asylum, which had been adopted unanimously by the Sixth Committee at its 988th meeting on 1 November 1967.[1] Another delegation had questioned the ratio legis of the convention. He had no doubts on that score, for new evidence of the crimes committed by the Nazis during the Second World War and of other criminal acts was discovered every day in Poland. The other element of the convention's ratio legis consisted in the fact that the international search for war criminals was a matter of current concern.

32. Since the General Assembly had stated in resolutions 2184 (XXI) and 2202 (XXI) that the policies of apartheid should be regarded as a crime against humanity, those policies should be mentioned in the convention. The support which many delegations had given to the draft convention emphasized the world-wide importance of that instrument. In conclusion, he wished to express his delegation's gratitude to those members of the Committee who had supported his Government's initiative.

33. Mr. PAOLINI (France) express regret that during the debate some delegations, referring to certain members of the Committee, had spoken of emotional reactions; the emotion felt by those who had suffered as a result of war crimes was understandable and should be respected by all. The delegations whose countries had not experienced those crimes should not take too rigid a position; to vote against the convention would mean granting an amnesty to the guilty persons, and the General Assembly could not give its approval to that.

34. Three closely related concepts were involved: the definition of the crimes in question, the principle of the non-applicability of statutory limitation and the retroactivity of the convention. The reason the item was still on the Committee's agenda was precisely in order to prevent the criminals concerned from escaping punishment. If the convention was not adopted, the only recourse remaining to the victims would be a kind of private justice, and, since international crimes were involved, that would mean interference in the internal affairs of States, with all the serious consequences resulting therefrom. With regard to retroactivity, he observed that it would be difficult to make statutory limitation inapplicable to war crimes and, at the same time, permit domestic legal provisions to prescribe such a limitation. Some delegations had contended that non-retroactivity, which was a principle of domestic law, should also apply in international law, particularly where a convention on war crimes was involved. He would recall, in that connexion, that article 7 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms provided that war crimes and crimes against humanity should be an exception to that principle. Although that convention was a regional one, it formed part of the

[1] See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 89, document A/6912.

domestic legislation of the countries which had ratified it. It could not be denied, however, that with the recognition in the European Convention of the principle of the non-applicability of statutory limitation to war crimes—and, as a corollary, of the concept of retroactivity—that principle had become a rule of positive international law.

35. Mrs. KULAKOVSKAYA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), exercising her right of reply, said that she had been happy to note that most delegations had expressed their readiness to approve the draft convention. At the same time, some of the Committee members had urged that war crimes should be forgotten and war criminals pardoned, their contention being that the Federal Republic of Germany had renounced its past. According to the United Kingdom representative (1518th meeting), the Byelorussian SSR delegation had said particularly harsh things against that country. She pointed out, in that connexion, that she had merely mentioned one or two facts indicative of the rebirth of fascism in the Federal Republic. The United Kingdom delegation seemed to view the world through rose-coloured spectacles, but the peoples of Europe had suffered greatly from the two world wars unleashed by German militarism, whose 60 million victims included many British subjects. Europeans were perfectly entitled to be concerned at the disturbing outlook in the Federal Republic of Germany. It was not only the delegations of the socialist countries which should feel concern for future generations; so too should the United Kingdom delegation, which represented a capitalist country.

36. The United Kingdom delegation was apparently trying to convince itself that the Federal Republic of Germany had no connexions with the hitlerite past and was a genuinely democratic State. However, the past establishment at Bonn included one hundred generals and admirals and several hundreds more civil servants and officials responsible for the administration of justice who were former war criminals. It might be contended that such persons had been re-educated, but the climate prevailing in that country appeared rather to favour the rebirth of fascism. A neo-nazi party had been formed there three years previously, and recent events showed that there could be no guarantee that the Federal Republic would not once against be swept by "brown-shirt fever". The neo-nazi party leaders had announced their rejection of the Potsdam Agreements and had advocated frontier readjustments. It should be remembered that the victorious Powers had declared at Potsdam that German militarism would be eradicated and steps taken to ensure that Germany would not become a threat to the peoples of the world. The United Kingdom representative had not denied that the party in question was growing, but had argued that the "free world" must tolerate all political parties and had expressed the conviction that the democratic forces would be able to resist the challenge. In that case, it might be well asked why the "free world" feared the Communist Party, which had been banned in the Federal Republic of Germany for eleven years.

37. Se wondered how the revanchist German leaders would act if they had access to nuclear weapons; it was not difficult to imagine what would happen in that case. In the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, democratic principles had really triumphed and the interests of the people were paramount. The demands put forward by German imperialism for changes in European frontiers showed, she concluded, that it was still a threat to the security of all nations.

38. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) exercising her right of reply, said that the Byelorussian SSR representative did not appear to be very up-to-date about the United Kingdom, perhaps because she was not very familiar with the workings of democracy. There was a socialist Government in Britain and a mixed economy. She pointed out that the United Kingdome also had lost many dead in the two World Wars and that the Byelorussian representative was not alone in her anxiety to prevent a repetition of such events. True, there were retrograde political forces in the Federal Republic of Germany, but it was to be hoped that the democratic forces would prevail. She observed that every government, whatever its complexion, could become susceptible to bad influences. There had been a communist Government in the Soviet Union in 1939, but that had not prevented the Stalin-Hitler pact.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77301—August 1968—2,225