



CONTENTS

Agenda items 55, 56 and 57:

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

- (a) Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (*continued*):

- (a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

General debate (*continued*) . . . . .

Page

323

countries and territories (*continued*) (A/7603, chap. IX, sect. A; A/7660, A/7762, A/C.3/619, A/C.3/L.1659, E/CN.4/950, E/CN.4/984 and Add.1-19):

- (a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) stressed how important the question of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination had become since the entry into force of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination adopted in 1965, and she expressed the hope that the Committee for which provision was made in article 8 of that instrument, and of which her country was proud to be a member, would soon embark on its labours. In that connexion, she did not believe that the election of the Federal Republic of Germany—which was a State Party to the Convention—as a member of that Committee raised a political problem which ought to be dealt with in the Third Committee.

2. In her delegation's opinion, the programme set out in document A/7649 for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would give added impetus to the efforts being made by the United Nations to eliminate the prejudice which was the root cause of those forms of social blight. Of particular importance in that regard was any campaign of publicity directed more particularly towards young persons and children, for if the elimination of the evils of racism was to have lasting effect, it must be initiated as soon as the individual reached the age of reason. The efforts to eliminate racism must not, moreover, be concentrated exclusively on the racial discrimination practised by certain white minorities but must be extended to all kinds of racial prejudice regardless of the colour and the nationality status of the group affected. She was particularly in favour of the measures put forward by the Secretary-General in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of suggestion C and in suggestions D, E and F of document A/7649.

3. Among the measures suggested to ensure the implementation of the instruments for protecting the victims of racial discrimination and to guarantee respect for human rights, she expressed particular interest in the proposal for the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and she hoped that a preliminary examination of that question could be undertaken at the present session of the General Assembly.

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH  
 (Mauritania).

**AGENDA ITEMS 55, 56 AND 57**

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/7649 and Add.1, A/7667, A/7688, A/C.3/L.1733, A/C.3/L.1738 and Add.1):

- (a) Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General

Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7581/Rev.1, A/7603, chap. IX, sect. C; A/7683, A/C.3/617, A/C.3/618)

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent

4. With regard to the question of measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance, it would seem to be out of order to conjure up the ghost of an ideology which had passed into history in order to make political attacks against the Federal Republic of Germany. Such attacks did not make any real contribution to efforts to eliminate racial intolerance and prejudice. The results of the elections recently held in that State made it impossible for anyone to assert with any sincerity that there had been a resurgence of nazism or to deny such an obvious fact as the strengthening of representative democracy in the Federal Republic of Germany.

5. In so far as agenda item 57 was concerned, the work of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa was to some extent being duplicated by what the Commission on Human Rights was doing with regard to the same matter. That situation was apt to impair the effectiveness of the efforts in question.

6. Costa Rica was, moreover, deeply disturbed by the sufferings of political prisoners, irrespective of whether they were victims of the struggle against *apartheid* or of the oppression of dictatorships of the left or right, and it was similarly disturbed at the fate that might be in store for prisoners of war in North Viet-Nam in consequence of the non-observance by the Hanoi authorities of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Her country believed that the political elements of the problem must not be allowed to prevent the Third Committee from concerning itself with the humanitarian aspects, and it could not but be surprised that the mere mention of that question gave rise to angry protests by the very same parties that extraneously introduced the problem of Viet-Nam into all the bodies and organs of the United Nations but objected to that problem being properly examined by the United Nations.

7. The Geneva Conventions had also been cited as a ground for accusing Israel of violating human rights in the Arab territories which it was presently occupying and also as a means of drawing attention to the suffering being visited upon Israel communities by terrorists or upon the Jews in Arab countries where they constituted a minority. The Costa Rican delegation deplored all violations of human rights regardless of where they occurred, and it urged all the parties affected by the tension in the Middle East to co-operate with the United Nations in order to bring to an end the sufferings of the innocent, who were always the ones who fared the worst in any armed conflict.

8. With specific regard to *apartheid*, she stated once again that the most effective peaceful means of overcoming the persistent refusal of South Africa to do anything in that respect would be the effective application of the sanctions which the United Nations had called for. Costa Rica fully sympathized with the oppressed people of South Africa, and it had given evidence of its faith in the United Nations by conscientiously complying with all the resolutions which had been adopted in the matter. The co-operation of all countries, both large and small, in that endeavour would be a pledge of the success of the struggle against *apartheid*.

9. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) expressed gratification that the International Conven-

tion on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination had come into force in January 1969, and she recalled that her country, which had always been an enemy of every kind of discrimination, had already ratified that instrument and was a member of the Committee which had been set up by virtue of the Convention. It was imperative for the universality of the Convention to be ensured in order that all countries might have an opportunity to contribute to the efforts being made to combat racial discrimination. The achievement of that objective had unfortunately not been possible, for although the Federal Republic of Germany was a member of the Committee in question, the Western Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization had prevented the German Democratic Republic from joining it.

10. The proposal for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was to be commended, for it represented a step forward in the cause of equality. Her country had in that regard submitted specific proposals (see A/7649/Add.1) for strengthening the efforts being made at the national and international levels to put an end for all time to every form of discrimination, including colonialism, segregation and *apartheid* and also the resurgence of nazism. In so far as the last-mentioned question was concerned, she maintained that, contrary to what some speakers had said, the nazi ideology had not died, and those who had suffered from it in their own flesh were alarmed to see how the germs of nazism were proliferating in the Federal Republic of Germany and were posing a grave threat to the entire world. In view, therefore, of the determination of the neo-nazi party, with the support of certain influential groups, to gain power, all progressive forces must act decisively to bar the way to that movement and thus put an end to the activities of the militaristic groups. She referred in that regard to Economic and Social Council resolution 1417 (XLVI)—which had been based on a recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, which, in turn, had been initiated by the delegations of Poland and the Ukrainian SSR—in which a draft resolution which deserved the support of all the members of the Third Committee had been recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

11. With regard to *apartheid*, the main reason why such a policy continued to be applied in South Africa and in Namibia seemed to her to be the military assistance being given to the South African Government by the NATO Powers. She accordingly supported the recommendations appearing in the Secretary-General's report (A/7660) even though she had some reservations regarding certain provisions which they contained.

12. As to the inhuman treatment being meted out by the military clique of Israel to the Arabs living in the occupied territories, General Moshe Dayan, according to information appearing in *The New York Times*, had announced that Israel intended to keep on applying measures of collective reprisal against the Arab population concerned. Such practices constituted criminal acts that were condemned by the entire world.

13. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) recalled that some twenty or more years ago, the great mass of the oppressed and humiliated peoples of the earth had wel-

comed with great hope the solemn proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which had been regarded as an instrument for ending all discrimination based on considerations of race, religion, political opinion, sex or language. The object of the Declaration had been to guarantee respect for the equality of all human beings and the dignity of the individual as the essential element of the new world order which the framers of the United Nations Charter had wanted to set up on a basis of international co-operation, collective security and universal harmony. That magnificent dream had unfortunately not yet become reality for the millions of human beings whose race or colour made them an object of discrimination and caused them to suffer privation and torture.

14. While it was gratifying that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which the Central African Republic had signed in March 1966, had entered into force, she felt compelled to point out that, in various places and for various reasons, basic human rights and freedoms continued to be denied, in open violation of the United Nations Charter and all international instruments dealing with human rights. No one could claim ignorance of the atrocities and the inhuman treatment suffered by peoples whose rights were disregarded and who were denied justice, freedom and peace.

15. The most hateful racial discrimination prevailed in southern Africa. If they persisted in their cruel practices, the Governments of that part of the world might unleash a conflict which would endanger international peace and security. Her delegation vehemently condemned the evils of racial discrimination and the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, but it believed that, rather than further condemnation of these ignoble practices, what was needed was an effort to find early solutions to the serious problems which they created. In that endeavour the Third Committee should be guided by the peace-loving spirit which characterized the United Nations Charter and should remember that the Organization continued to be the best, if not the only, hope for the cause of humanity. It was still possible, with the goodwill of all its Members, for the United Nations to serve as a centre for the co-ordination of the efforts of all nations to attain common pacific objectives for the greater well-being of all peoples.

16. Her delegation wished to draw the attention of the representatives of administering Powers to the message of peace which the sovereign nations of the African continent had transmitted to the General Assembly in the Manifesto on Southern Africa.<sup>1</sup> In that document the independent African States pleaded that an end should be put to the violent negation of human dignity by the oppressors of Africa, that there should be negotiation rather than destruction, dialogue rather than war, and that peaceful steps should be taken towards emancipation.

17. The Central African Republic, whose Constitution solemnly proclaimed its respect for human rights and the principles of the United Nations Charter, would support any proposal designed to bring about the immediate cessation of all forms of racial discrimination.

18. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) deplored the inhuman practices of *apartheid* in South Africa and expressed the hope that the various organs of the United Nations would soon find effective means of resolving the problem. Likewise, she whole-heartedly supported the Organization's efforts to combat nazism and racial intolerance. At the same time, she considered that the Committee's activities should not be centred exclusively on those two questions, since there were other violations of human rights which the Nicaraguan people regarded as particularly serious.

19. In that connexion it should be noted that violations of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could be committed as a result of conflicts between States and also within a country as a result of measures designed to stifle political dissent. In the first case it was always possible to have recourse to public denunciation or accusation, as had often been done in the Committee, or to request an investigation by an international body of the practices which might constitute violations of human rights. In the second case, however, the victims had no means of defence, and she wondered what the citizens of countries where fundamental rights were violated by their own Governments could do to protect their freedoms and how those citizens could defend themselves against régimes which, while praising democracy in international bodies, in their own territory openly violated article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which proclaimed that everyone had the right to take part in the government of his country and to express his will in free elections. Since an investigation of a violation of human rights could only be instituted on the request of a Government, it was very difficult for a majority group of a country to bring its complaints to public knowledge, when its wishes were flouted by unpopular minority groups which had gained power and deprived others of the right to demand, through lawful representatives, respect for the principles proclaimed in the United Nations Charter. Governments set up against the will of the people could not represent their countries, much less claim to defend national sovereignty, which really belonged to the peoples whose rights those régimes were violating.

20. The Nicaraguan people fervently hoped that the thirty articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would cease to be a dead letter and that, by the adoption of more effective measures and the exercise of broader powers, in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter, implementation of those noble principles would be ensured for the good of all peoples whose fundamental rights were now being violated.

21. Mr. BARRY (Guinea) said that, despite the considerable efforts made by the United Nations and other bodies, the South African Government persisted in its disregard of the rules of international law and the resolutions of the United Nations. It was an insult to the international conscience that a racist minority should have established a system of inhuman aggression, coercion and exploitation of a people numbering more than 13 million, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. It was also deplorable that that racist Government continued to offend the conscience of mankind by the course of unbridled expansionism it had adopted in intensifying its policy of

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

*apartheid* in Namibia, a Territory placed under the direct administration of the United Nations.

22. Certain States members of NATO, trade partners of South Africa, bore the sole responsibility for the failure of the United Nations to put an end to *apartheid*. His delegation condemned that attitude and again called upon them to break off all ties with the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury without delay.

23. Ian Smith's obstinacy in Southern Rhodesia was due to the fact that the United Kingdom, which his delegation condemned vehemently, had not been willing to assume its full responsibility as administering Power, much less to apply strictly the decisions adopted by the United Nations. The conspiracy between Portugal, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa was common knowledge; its purpose was to establish a bastion of racism below the Zambezi, based on a retrograde, reactionary and nazi policy in an effort to withstand the invigorating wave of freedom in Africa. Those countries' efforts were in vain, however, because they were moving against the current of history, and the violations of international law which they committed, such as the seizure by the Portuguese authorities of a Guinean coastal vessel transporting students who were returning from their school holidays, or the detention, in Guinea (Bissau), of a Guinean civil aircraft which had been compelled to land for technical reasons, could not prevent the freedom fighters from winning in the end. Portugal was a poor country, with one of the most backward economies in Europe, which was supported only by the States members of NATO, and which, in order to keep the real situation from public knowledge, relied in its domestic policy on a dictatorship which was both morally and materially degrading. Real power, however, was measured not by the amount of military equipment but by the justice of the goal, and, despite the deplorable situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination, the valiant freedom fighters, methodically organized in their respective movements, had no doubts on that score.

24. He supported the draft resolution which the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1417 (XLVI), recommended to the General Assembly for adoption and the programme proposed by the Secretary-General for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/7649).

25. He believed that the establishment of a radio broadcasting station and its rational use in South Africa would enable the specialized agencies better to publicize the decisions adopted by the United Nations against *apartheid*, in its great task of restoring peace, justice and prosperity throughout the world.

26. Mr. JOSHI (Nepal) deplored the fact that, more than two decades after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it was still necessary to discuss and condemn racism, nazism, *apartheid* and all other forms of racial discrimination, which denied man's inherent right to live in dignity, freedom, equality and justice. Nevertheless, he was convinced that all violations of human rights, whether in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese colonies, the Middle East, Viet-Nam or elsewhere, would eventually cease. His delegation gave its

whole-hearted support to the efforts made by the United Nations and its various organs to combat injustice, inhumanity and cruelty, and it welcomed the Secretary-General's plan to prepare periodic reports on racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres, for consideration as advocated by the International Conference on Human Rights. Likewise, he welcomed the entry into force of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and supported the programme proposed by the Secretary-General for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/7649).

27. With regard to the measures to be adopted against nazism and racial intolerance, he would like to express his gratitude to the Secretary-General for his excellent report on the subject (A/7683) and for his firm support of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1417 (XLVI), for adoption by the General Assembly.

28. His country had had the honour to belong from the outset to the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and had had an opportunity to expound at length its position in regard to the policies of *apartheid* and segregation when that item had been discussed in the Special Political Committee; he would therefore merely reiterate his most strenuous opposition to such abominable practices and policies, rightly described by the General Assembly as crimes against humanity. In that connexion, it was unfortunate that the repeated resolutions of the United Nations concerning the severance of diplomatic, commercial, military, cultural and other relations with the racist Government of South Africa and the illegal régime of the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia were still not being observed by a number of Member States, including some of the permanent members of the Security Council, which as such ought to be the champions of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The States in question had not only declined to pay heed to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for an arms embargo and economic sanctions against the racist régimes, but they had increased their military supplies to those régimes and their economic dealings with them. It was high time that those activities were brought to an end; they constituted an obstacle to the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese domination, and the other colonial territories, and they frustrated efforts to eliminate *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa. As a measure designed to achieve those objectives, the proposal for setting up a United Nations radio unit in Africa to produce and transmit radio broadcast programmes to the population of southern Africa had his delegation's support.

29. Mr. CHIPESO (Zambia) said that today subtle forms of discrimination were being practised in many parts of the world, especially in the educational field, where teaching programmes were being drawn up to inculcate a sense of inferiority and dependence in the members of a particular race. Such discrimination in education on racial grounds led in turn to discrimination in employment, so that the

Africans and Asians of South Africa found themselves from birth onwards in an unfavourable position, for the educational system they were obliged to follow was not determined by their potential capacity but by their racial classification. Obviously they could not receive a fair wage for services rendered if the criterion for the distribution of jobs was based on race. Clearly therefore, racial discrimination did not make for the full economic and productive utilization of human resources. Racial discrimination was a deadly disease and one of the main causes of unrest and conflict in the world of today. While it was an undoubted fact that racism existed in many countries, it was only in South Africa that it had been officially sanctioned by law. The Nazi ideology, which it had been the fundamental purpose of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to eliminate, was flourishing again today in the policy of *apartheid*, and it should be remembered that in the Nazi period the South African authorities had been staunch supporters of the cause of Nazism, and they had never forsaken it.

30. For many years the United Nations had been adopting resolutions condemning *apartheid*, but the South African Government had ignored them with impunity and had proceeded with its pernicious and degrading policy. The confidence felt by the Pretoria Government was due to the support it received from certain States Members of the United Nations which had economic interests in South Africa and were prepared to sacrifice the lives of millions of Africans in that country, as well as in Rhodesia and the so-called Portuguese overseas provinces of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to protect their investments. But the States in question should bear in mind that in countries where racism and hate prevailed, human life was perpetually in danger, and in those circumstances it was inevitable that the situation would explode sooner or later, ruining the investments they were anxious to protect. His delegation urged those States to adopt decisive measures to eliminate the policy of *apartheid*, since although South Africa was aware that its policy was harmful, it had sufficient arms to stifle any internal opposition, and the arms came from the Western Powers. The diabolical policy of *apartheid* in South Africa had spread to Southern Rhodesia, and unless those Powers intervened, the responsibility for the suffering and loss of life that ensued would be laid at their door. Portugal too must not forget that the Africans of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) would continue their struggle for their rights until they gained them.

31. The delegation of Zambia supported the Secretary-General's programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and trusted that as a result of the activities outlined in that document the Governments of South Africa and Portugal, the Southern Rhodesian régime and any other countries where racism was practised would come to realize the evil of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

32. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that the purpose of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was to achieve substantial progress in eliminating all forms and manifestations of racism and racial discrimination, including policies of segregation and *apartheid*; hence it fully supported the suggestions of the

Secretary-General in document A/7649. Ceylon's position in those questions was well known. Ceylon did not practise any type of discrimination based on race, colour, national or ethnic origin, and it deplored the continuation of such practices in other parts of the world. Its Constitution and laws provided comprehensive safeguards against violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

33. It was unfortunate that whenever those questions were discussed in the Third Committee, the debate consisted largely of accusations and counter-accusations by Member States. Perhaps that was inevitable, but members should not forget what was the Committee's task in regard to human rights, namely, to solve the problems of human rights the world over. The delegation of Ceylon would refrain from saying anything that would further inflame passions or increase bitterness in the world, and was prepared to do everything possible to promote international peace and harmony and heal the wounds caused by misunderstanding, by needless invective and by war. Guidance might be sought in the words of Buddha when he exhorted men to overcome anger by gentleness, evil by good, and lying by truth. Like President Kennedy, the delegation of Ceylon hoped that the United Nations would not be used as a forum for invective and propaganda; no doubt that hope was shared by the majority of the Members of the United Nations.

34. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan), exercising the right of reply, said that the "outdated" laws referred to by the representative of Israel had been abrogated by Jordan as early as 1948 under Law No. 20, published in the *Official Gazette* of Jordan, No. 945 of 16 May 1948. It was Israel that had continued to enforce them after 1948 and after June 1967. It was true that there was no capital punishment in Israel; but it was also true that Arab prisoners were dying in Israel's prisons. In the case of one such prisoner, Kasim Abu Ikr, Jordanians from Jerusalem had asked the International Committee of the Red Cross to conduct an autopsy, but the Israelis had refused to allow it. The representative of Israel had also referred to statements by prisoners, but he had failed to say under what conditions those statements were taken from the prisoners, and he had chosen not to talk about the tortures to which Arab prisoners were subjected. If the Israel authorities did not accept those facts, at least they should allow the three projected missions to investigate the living conditions of the Arab population of the occupied territories.

35. With regard to the violations of human rights by Israel in the field of education, the Israel representative had ignored the examples cited by the Jordanian delegation and had instead referred again to a pamphlet issued by the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which was a masterpiece of propaganda. As for the suppression of certain passages in Arab school textbooks, the Israel writer Amos Elon, in an article entitled "The Israeli Occupation" published in March 1968 in the New York magazine *Commentary*, had written that the Israel Ministry of Education had tried to impose Israel textbooks on Arab school children in the west bank area, complete with Arabic translations of Zionist leaders and writers. The reaction of the parents and teachers had been an almost total strike which had closed down all the west bank schools. As a compromise the Ministry had agreed to withdraw the Israel textbooks in

exchange for the censoring or elimination of “offensive” Arab books. Having failed to achieve its initial purpose of suppressing some seventy Arab texts it had decided to censor them, eliminating something like 120 objectionable passages on the grounds that they were an incitement to hatred. Among the passages were quotations from the Koran and poems extolling the beauty of the Palestine landscape that was now Israel.

36. The representative of Israel had confirmed that some passages had been deleted from Arab textbooks but had not given any reason for the deletion by the Israel authorities of all reference to United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine or to the revolutions of Morocco, Algeria and Libya. All those questions were of secondary importance in relation to the interference of Israel as an occupying Power in the education of Jordanian children, which was the gravest of all violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms and had been condemned by UNESCO. Israel had prohibited the use, on the west bank and in Gaza, of textbooks which had been approved by UNESCO and UNRWA.

37. The English writer Walter Schwartz, author of the book *The Arabs in Israel*, had described how the Israel authorities took the Arabs' lands and jobs “for security reasons” without giving any other explanation, no doubt also “for security reasons”.

38. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that her Government had not ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination because it needed to study with the greatest care an instrument which under the Federal Constitution would, when ratified, become the law of the land, scrupulously applied by the courts.

39. Secondly, she recalled that the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany had signed a treaty of friendship and non-aggression which had remained in force from 1939 until mid-1941. During that time, a number of countries which had hitherto been independent had become part of the Soviet Union. She disagreed with the interpretation which the Soviet Union representative had placed on that fact of history.

40. With regard to the Soviet Union representative's comments concerning civil rights and short-comings in the administration of justice in the United States, she failed to understand why the Soviet Union, which had objected to any change in the United Nations procedure for dealing with communications concerning violations of human rights on the ground that that would be an assault on State sovereignty, had no hesitation in raising that question in connexion with the United States or other countries. She agreed in that respect with the comments of the United Kingdom concerning two petitions from Soviet citizens which had been received by the Commission on Human Rights. She hoped the Soviet Union would agree that those petitions should be given careful consideration, in view of its great concern for violations of human rights in other parts of the world.

41. Lastly, as the Soviet Union representative had quoted Pushkin in support of her arguments, she herself would like

to quote the Soviet writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who had recently been expelled by the writers' union of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. In a letter to the union, published in *The New York Times* of 15 November 1969, he had said that the first thing men belonged to was humanity, that humanity was separated from the animal world by thought and speech, and that they should naturally be free. If they were fettered, men went back to being animals. Publicity and openness—that was the prime condition for the health of every society. The man who did not want publicity for his fatherland did not want to cleanse it of its disease.

42. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to propose that the draft resolution on the violation of human rights in the Middle East which his delegation would be submitting jointly with other delegations should be considered immediately after the conclusion of the general debate on the three items under consideration.

43. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) stated, in connexion with that proposal, that at the very time when the world community was agreed in condemning violations of human rights such violations were continuing in the Israel-occupied territories. The Zionist authorities were applying a policy of “collective punishment”, destroying homes and razing whole villages, and using all kinds of coercive methods to bring about a mass exodus of the population of the occupied territories—all in reprisal for the refusal of the Arab residents to become informers and for their passive resistance to the occupation. Despite General Assembly resolution 2452 (XXIII), calling upon Israel to expedite the return of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had occurred, Israel had adopted measures which would have exactly the opposite effect. It was therefore essential that the Committee should act immediately to protect the human rights of the population of the occupied territories.

44. Mr. LORCH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that some representatives had once again repeated the same allegations of tortures, murders and mass expulsions without advancing any evidence. On the question of the deletion of certain passages from Arab textbooks, the writer Amos Elon had been quoted repeatedly, but incorrectly and incompletely. Some of the passages that had been deleted were reproduced in a booklet entitled *Hatred is Sacred* and in other, similar booklets, which he would make available to the Committee, since material from Jordanian sources had also been distributed. The most effective reply to the allegations that had been made was the fact that students in Gaza and on the west bank were continuing to take the same examinations as they always had done, which were prepared in Cairo or Amman; they would not be able to do that if they were not using the same textbooks. The changes which had been made were minimal, but they were necessary in order to prevent incitement to violence and to genocide.

45. He did not believe that the Pakistan representative's motion was inspired by a concern for human rights; rather, it was an attempt to push through the adoption of a draft resolution without giving representatives time to consult their Governments properly.

46. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he did not think that the assertions which the representative of Israel had just made would have any effect in the present case, especially in view of Israel's well-known attitude towards many resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights.

47. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said he was sorry that, because of its length, he could not read out the full text of the article by Amos Elon in order to satisfy the representative of Israel. Referring to the United States representative's comments on respect for human rights, especially in connexion with Viet-Nam, he said that everyone would have seen the recent report in *The New York Times* of the massacre of hundreds of Viet-Nameese by United States soldiers. Where Viet-Nam was concerned, the most eloquent reply was, perhaps, the recent anti-war demonstration in Washington.

48. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) said that, on the question of the urgency of adopting a resolution on the Middle East, he would draw the attention of the representative of Israel to two reports published in *The New York Times*. The first, on 13 November 1969, concerned the "collective punishment" which the Israel authorities had imposed in order to induce the Arabs to give information about certain incidents; the other, on 15 November, referred to the destruction of the houses of those who did not supply the required information.

49. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the Palestine problem must be placed in its true perspective. The problem was the transplanting of a people and a religion into a territory belonging to another people, who had been forcibly expelled. Essentially, it was a problem of discrimination and religious intolerance. The only visa needed to enter Israel was the Jewish faith. A clear example of that was the case of Dr. Tannous, the former Director of the Palestine Arab refugee office. Dr. Tannous, a Christian Arab born in Palestine, who had lived all his life in Jerusalem, was now unable to return to the city for the simple reason that he was not Jewish. His ancestors had lived there for generations; he had to live in exile.

50. With regard to the statements of Mrs. Golda Meir, reported recently in the Press, to the effect that defeat for the United States in Viet-Nam would seriously jeopardize Israel's position in the Middle East, he wondered whether the Palestinian Arabs were simply pawns for the great Powers and whether the Prime Minister of Israel, who agreed with the policy of the United States in defence of the people of Viet-Nam, considered that the Palestinians were also a people.

51. Mr. BABAA (Libya), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the Israel delegation had not expressly refuted the charges made against it in the Committee and had offered no explanation of the tragic events which, as was known from press dispatches, were occurring daily in the occupied territories. Day after day there came news of new atrocities in that region, some of them vouched for by such reliable sources as a former Deputy Commissioner-General of UNRWA, and the Israel delegation's silence on the subject meant a tacit admission of those facts. The censorship imposed by the Israel authorities on news from the occupied territories prevented the real gravity of the situation in the area from becoming known. According to a recent Reuters dispatch, two persons had been killed in an occupied village simply because they had gone out of doors after the curfew imposed by the Israel forces, perhaps to seek food or water, and he wondered how many others had lost their lives without anything being known abroad of their fate. As had been acknowledged even by an Israel newspaper, there was no justification for Israel's actions in the occupied territories, since it was clear that the final objective of the Zionists was simply to drive all the Arabs out of Palestine.

52. The CHAIRMAN announced that, if there was no objection, the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions relating to the three items under discussion would be 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 19 November 1969.

*It was so agreed.*

*The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.*