



Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

**AGENDA ITEM 55**

**Youth, its education in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, its problems and needs, and its participation in national development: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7921 and Add.1, A/8003, chap. IX, sect. K; A/C.3/L.1764, A/C.3/L.1766/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1772, A/C.3/L.1773, A/C.3/L.1774 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1775-1778, A/C.3/L.1779/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1780-1783, A/C.3/L.1784 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1785-1789, A/C.3/L.1790 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1791, A/C.3/L.1792)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
(continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.1 had incorporated several amendments into their text; the newly revised version was contained in document A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2. The Togolese delegation was no longer a sponsor of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the twenty-five sponsors of the draft resolution, said that their purpose in preparing it had been to make a contribution to the Committee's consideration of the agenda item and that they categorically denied any other motive that might be attributed to them. They wished to thank all the delegations that had supported their efforts and made suggestions which had helped improve the text, particularly the representative of Iran, who had assisted them during the drafting stage. From the beginning, many delegations had participated in the drafting, at the invitation of the sponsors, and a spirit of co-operation had prevailed. If that atmosphere had changed, it was not the twenty-five Powers which were responsible but rather the delegations that had introduced a note of discord.

3. He wished to emphasize that all the sponsors were developing countries—most of them African or Asian—and all followed the policy of non-alignment. While they had not wished to disregard the views of other countries and had tried to incorporate all those suggestions which they thought would improve the text, it was only logical that their own views should prevail in the final drafting. On their behalf, he appealed to all those delegations whose amendments had not been included in the new text to withdraw their proposals, particularly those which added nothing new and those which had no chance of being approved by the

Committee. That would greatly help to expedite the consideration of the item.

4. He then indicated the changes which the sponsors had made in the preamble. The second paragraph incorporated the suggestions that had been made by Argentina, Costa Rica and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1790 and Corr.1 and by Hungary in document A/C.3/L.1777. In the third paragraph the sponsors had taken into account the Iraqi amendment in document A/C.3/L.1773. The fourth paragraph took account of the Czechoslovak amendment in document A/C.3/L.1783. The seventh paragraph reflected the idea expressed in the second amendment of Morocco and Mauritania (A/C.3/L.1789).

5. In the operative part of the text, paragraph 1 incorporated the Italian amendment in document A/C.3/L.1780 and the USSR oral proposal concerning the mention of General Assembly resolution 2037 (XX). Paragraph 2 was a new one based on the USSR amendment in document A/C.3/L.1774 and Corr.1 and 2. In redrafting the text which now appeared as paragraph 3 (former para. 2) the sponsors had borne in mind the relevant proposal made by Argentina, Costa Rica and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1790. Paragraph 5 was a new one which incorporated the first of the amendments proposed by the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom in document A/C.3/L.1778. At the suggestion of several delegations, paragraph 6 (former para. 4) had been shortened. Paragraph 7 (former para. 5) took into account the relevant amendment proposed by Argentina, Costa Rica and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1790. Paragraph 8 (former para. 6) incorporated the Turkish amendment (A/C.3/L.1781). Paragraph 9 (former para. 7) included the amendment proposed by Argentina, Costa Rica and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1790. Paragraph 11 incorporated the amendment proposed by France and Greece (A/C.3/L.1786) and paragraph 12 (former para. 10) reflected the amendment put forward by Ghana and Greece (A/C.3/L.1785).

6. He wished briefly to comment on the proposals that had not been incorporated into the revised draft resolution. The majority of the sponsors had been in favour of the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.1772); however, since it failed to command unanimous support it had been decided not to incorporate it in the revised text but to leave it to each of the sponsors of the draft resolution to vote on it according to its instructions. His delegation would support it when it was put to the vote. As to the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.1775), the sponsors had not objected to it in substance but had felt that its purpose was reflected in the revised draft resolution, especially in operative paragraph 8. They therefore wished to appeal to the Byelorussian delegation not to press for a vote on that amendment. Similarly, the spirit of the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/

L.1776) was reflected in operative paragraph 7 of the revised text and the sponsors appealed to that delegation too not to press its amendment. The sponsors had not been able to adopt the second Hungarian amendment in document A/C.3/L.1777 because they felt that the term "power politics" best expressed their intention. There was a considerable difference between militarism and power politics and they were referring particularly to the use of power in the conduct of world affairs, which was contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter. They accordingly appealed to the Hungarian delegation to reconsider its amendment.

7. All the sponsors of the draft resolution had strongly opposed the second part of the amendment put forward by the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1778) because it prejudged a decision which could be made only after the report of the Secretary-General had been discussed. If the amendment was not withdrawn, the sponsors of the draft resolution would request that it should be put to a roll-call vote. As to the Italian-United Kingdom amendment in document A/C.3/L.1779/Rev.1, the sponsors wished to apologize for not having taken it up at their last meeting. However, since it involved no substantive change in the draft resolution, it would not have been accepted in any case. The twenty-five Powers had not expressed any strong opposition to the Mongolian amendment (A/C.3/L.1782) but had felt that its intent was reflected in their text, especially the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, and they hoped the Mongolian delegation would not press it to a vote. They had all opposed the second Czechoslovak amendment in document A/C.3/L.1783 and they appealed to that delegation to reconsider it; if it was not withdrawn, they would ask for a roll-call vote. They had no objection to the third Czechoslovak amendment contained in the same document, but felt that it did not add anything new to the text and was in essence covered in operative paragraph 7; they therefore appealed to the Czechoslovak delegation to reconsider it. As to the fourth Czechoslovak amendment, they felt that it should be taken for granted that the Secretary-General would have to bear in mind the advisability of considering the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples.

8. With regard to the United States amendments (A/C.3/L.1784) the sponsors had unanimously opposed the first, for reasons which were known to all. They appealed to the United States delegation to reconsider that amendment, on which they would ask for a roll-call vote if it was not withdrawn. They had felt that the second United States amendment was unnecessary and hoped it would not be pressed. They had had no strong objection to the third United States amendment but had felt that it might prejudice the issue, since it would be for the participants in any future youth assembly to decide their own rules of procedure. They hoped the amendment would not be pressed. All of them had opposed the fourth United States amendment and they would ask for a roll-call vote if it was not withdrawn.

9. The Barbadian amendments (A/C.3/L.1787) had not been accepted because the sponsors of the draft resolution

had felt that the term "handicapped youth" was covered by the expression "all youth". Although none of the sponsors objected to the amendment in principle, they hoped that it would not be pressed. They had not accepted the Canadian amendment (A/C.3/L.1788) because they felt that the importance of the Charter was adequately emphasized in their text, particularly in the third and fourth preambular paragraphs; they would request a roll-call vote on the amendment if it was maintained.

10. With reference to the amendments put forward by Argentina, Costa Rica and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.1790 and Corr.1) which had not been incorporated in the revised text, the twenty-five Powers hoped that the amendment to the sixth preambular paragraph would be withdrawn, as it would create division among the developing countries and they were certain that that had not been the intention of the delegations concerned. If the latter pressed their amendment—in which case a roll-call vote would be requested—they would be responsible for the consequences. A roll-call vote would also be requested on the amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph. It was hoped that the amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph would be withdrawn. The twenty-five Powers had opposed the amendment to operative paragraph 3, which they considered negative in its approach; they hoped it would not be pressed. They likewise hoped the amendment to operative paragraph 4 would be withdrawn; otherwise they would request a roll-call vote on that text. They felt that all the amendments he had just mentioned would substantially alter their draft. They were also strongly opposed to the amendment to operative paragraph 6, on which they would request a roll-call vote.

11. With reference to the USSR delegation's oral amendment calling for the addition of the word "nazism" at the end of operative paragraph 8, the sponsors had felt that the term "racism, *apartheid* and all other forms of discrimination" included nazism. However, they had decided that instead of taking action as a bloc on that amendment they would each vote on it as they saw fit. His delegation would vote in favour of it.

12. He hoped the revised draft resolution would be of help to the Committee in its consideration of the item. One of the most urgent demands of youth was for unity and progress. The young people of today expected action and co-operation, no matter how imperfect; if the adults who were concerned with their problems did nothing, that would only add to their despair.

13. The CHAIRMAN asked the sponsors of amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2, which had not been accepted, to inform the Committee whether, in the light of the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia, they wished to maintain or withdraw those amendments. It would greatly facilitate the work of the Committee if the amendments were withdrawn.

14. Mr. FLORES (Argentina), speaking on behalf of his delegation and of the delegations of Costa Rica, Uruguay and Panama, which had also become a sponsor of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1790 and Corr.1, explained that some of their amendments were of such fundamental importance that they were not prepared to

withdraw them. Those were, in particular, the amendments to the sixth, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 4 of the revised draft resolution. They were willing, however, to withdraw the rest of their amendments.

15. Mr. MATHYS (Canada) said that his delegation was not in a position to withdraw its amendment (A/C.3/L.1788) inasmuch as it felt that a reference to the Charter of the United Nations in operative paragraph 8 of the revised draft resolution was essential.

16. Mr. PENTCHEV (Bulgaria) said that he had no objection to the Lebanese suggestion (1753rd meeting) that he should insert the words "of aggression" after the word "war" in the amendment proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1776). It was the duty of Governments to take effective and urgent measures against propaganda for wars of aggression, racial hatred and enmity, which had a harmful influence on the young and not only was contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations but also was frequently used quite openly to undermine the Organization's efforts. Consequently, he thought that operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution should make specific mention of that type of propaganda. After consultations with the Czechoslovak representative, it had been decided that the third amendment proposed by the latter (A/C.3/L.1783) would be combined with his own delegation's proposal. Accordingly, operative paragraph 7 would be expanded to include the words:

"and, to that end, to take effective steps to combat propaganda in favour of wars of aggression, racial hatred and hostility among peoples, as well as against Nazi and revanchist propaganda".

17. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the text of the revised draft resolution did not fully reflect his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1775). In his view, the draft should lay stress on the importance of resolute opposition by the young to military and other action designed to suppress liberation movements. The sole objection to that idea had been raised by the Canadian representative, but probably as the result of a misunderstanding. He thanked the representatives of Iraq and Lebanon for their oral sub-amendment to his proposal and agreed that the phrase "military occupation and" should be inserted after the word "under". If the representatives of Iraq and Lebanon agreed, he would request that his amendment (A/C.3/L.1775), as revised, should be put to the vote.

18. Miss WEEKES (Barbados) said that the Yugoslav representative had explained that the term "the handicapped" was not included as it was covered by the term "youth". However, she noted that that principle was not observed throughout the resolution, for, in paragraph 12, two categories of youth were pinpointed—"young workers" and "rural youth"; hence, "the handicapped" as a special category should also be included. If the term "the handicapped" was added in the phrase "young workers and rural youth", her delegation would be prepared to withdraw its amendments (A/C.3/L.1787). Otherwise she would request a separate vote on the paragraph in question.

19. Mr. PAOLINI (France) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for incorporating in their text the major

part of the amendment which had been submitted by the Greek delegation and his own (A/C.3/L.1786) and which would consequently be withdrawn.

20. Mr. SEKYIAMA (Ghana), speaking on behalf of his own and the Greek delegation, expressed satisfaction that the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1785 had been included in the revised text of the draft resolution. Accordingly, that amendment was now withdrawn. He would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, since, in essence, it expressed his delegation's views.

21. Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom) said she was gratified that the sponsors of the draft had been able to incorporate in their text the first part of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1778. However, the Netherlands, New Zealand and United Kingdom delegations attached considerable importance to the second part of their amendment and welcomed the request by the Yugoslav representative for a roll-call vote on it, for they believed that Governments should not be asked at the present time to adopt a firm position on the question of convening future world youth assemblies.

22. Her delegation and that of Italy would not press the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1779/Rev.1 since it had been accepted, though expressed in a somewhat different form. On the other hand, they wished to retain the second proposal set forth in that document, which welcomed the generous contribution youth was already making to voluntary services. That was intended to be entirely uncontroversial.

23. Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2 for their acceptance of the first of his delegation's amendments set forth in document A/C.3/L.1783. However, he felt that the second amendment in that document was of considerable importance. His own and other socialist countries had always supported the efforts of the developing nations to gain economic independence, to improve their economic and social standards and to take their rightful place in the world economy. Moreover, they would continue, so far as they were able, to provide the developing countries with economic assistance—both bilaterally and through the United Nations—on the basis of full equality and mutual respect for national sovereignty and national interests. Traditionally they had sought to strengthen and promote economic and technical co-operation with the developing countries, a fundamental principle which lay at the root of what was, in principle, a positive attitude towards the Second United Nations Development Decade. On the other hand, the socialist countries had never taken part in the colonial exploitation of the developing countries and could not accept the idea of equal responsibility for their under-development. In fact, such responsibility lay fully and exclusively with the former colonial Powers and capitalist States, which even now pursued policies of neo-colonialism and exploitation. His delegation had proposed the amendment in question solely for that reason and it hoped that its position would be understood and interpreted correctly.

24. At the same time, it was his hope that the Bulgarian-Czechoslovak amendment concerning operative paragraph 7

(A/C.3/L.1792) would be adopted. Lastly, his delegation wished to retain its fourth amendment in document A/C.3/L.1783. Although the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding among Peoples had been adopted in 1965, the United Nations had not yet paid adequate attention to the question of its implementation.

25. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their endeavours to produce the best possible text and for their incorporation of the concept underlying the first of his delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1777). However, he noted that some reservations had been expressed with regard to his delegation's second amendment, which proposed that the words "power politics" in the eighth preambular paragraph should be replaced by "militarism". Government meant the exercise of political power, and differences undeniably existed in the way in which such power was wielded. It was essential to distinguish between a policy of aggression and a policy of defence. The term "power politics" was very broad in meaning and should therefore be qualified. Consequently, he wished to revise his amendment by inserting the word "aggressive" before "power politics", thus making the meaning clearer and avoiding an unnecessarily cumbersome text. If that proposal was not acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution, it should be put to the vote.

26. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their acceptance of some of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1790 and Corr.1, of which the delegation of Panama had now become a co-sponsor. She was particularly pleased at the inclusion of the reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the second preambular paragraph, but also attached fundamental importance to the proposed amendments to the sixth, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs of the revised draft resolution, which had not been accepted. In particular, she had expressed serious reservations regarding the World Youth Assembly, at which the Costa Rican delegation had been deprived of its right of free speech. The Lebanese representative had proposed that both the resolution to be adopted by the Committee and the summary records of its deliberations should be transmitted to the participants in the Youth Assembly, and she therefore felt that adoption of the proposal concerning the ninth preambular paragraph had become even more necessary. For the same reason, it was essential that operative paragraph 3 should be amended to include the words "and the vigilant preservation of freedom of speech". In pressing for the amendments in question, she, together with the other sponsors, was assuming responsibility not for sowing disunity in the Committee but for resolving differences of opinion democratically by means of a vote—thus offering the young an example of the settlement of differences through parliamentary procedure.

27. She welcomed the retention of the phrase "to end the arms race and power politics" in the eighth preambular paragraph, for the world should be governed by respect for human rights and the principles of justice, not force. Lastly, she considered that nazism was a practice which had been eliminated at the end of the Second World War and she supported the proposal put forward by the Netherlands representative at the 1754th meeting to employ the much broader term "totalitarian ideologies and practices".

28. Miss EDMONDS (United States of America) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their painstaking efforts to accommodate widely differing views. She was fully aware of the significance of a resolution on the item under consideration and of the desirability of producing a meaningful and broadly acceptable document. She now wished to revise the second of the United States amendments in document A/C.3/L.1784 by inserting the words "of membership" after the word "conditions".

29. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking into account, at least partially, the wish of his delegation to add a new paragraph after operative paragraph 1. Since the principal intention of the paragraph had been incorporated in the draft resolution, his delegation would withdraw its amendment (A/C.3/L.1774 and Corr.1 and 2).

30. With regard to his delegation's oral proposal to insert the word "nazism" after "racism" at the end of operative paragraph 8, he agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the term "racism" was broad enough to include "nazism" and also "*apartheid*". Yet the sponsors had quite rightly decided to make special reference to *apartheid*, because the modern world was well aware of the horrors connected with that concept; there could be no question of hair-splitting in that regard, for the existence of *apartheid* was demonstrated by hard facts. Thus, his delegation's proposal to add a single small word to a paragraph which referred to another concept already covered by a broader term seemed to be unexceptionable. The Soviet Union always supported proposals to refer specifically to *apartheid*, although its people fortunately had no direct experience of that phenomenon: the USSR was completely free from colour consciousness and took a firm stand against all manifestations of racism. Perhaps the representatives of Lesotho and Costa Rica felt that they had more experience of nazism than the Soviet Union and could therefore assert that the concept of nazism was dead; in any case, the USSR was well aware of the problems facing the peoples of other countries and supported them on all questions of principle. Some delegations did not agree with the Costa Rican representative that nazism was a thing of the past; but if that theory was correct, why were certain countries objecting so strenuously to the inclusion of a reference to it in the draft resolution? Even if some people wished to close their eyes to the fact that, in New York alone, an immense number of publications could be found which propagated nazism, with reference, not to the past, but to the present and future, they must realize that nazism and *apartheid* were equivalent in the minds of large segments of the world's population and that a mention of nazism would help peoples who had suffered from it but not from *apartheid* to attain a better understanding of the tribulations of peoples subjected to the latter. Even if it was assumed that the concept of nazism was dead, it was a fact that 50 million people had died because of it. If only to honour the memory of those victims, anyone who really wished to combat racism and *apartheid* should have no objection to the adoption of his delegation's proposal. Specific facts concerning the continuing prevalence of nazism would certainly be adduced during the debates on measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance under agenda item 49. Meanwhile, it was hard to understand why the sponsors of the draft resolution had

hesitated to include the reference. The crucial point was not whether the term "nazism" was covered by "racism" but the fact that nazism was as shameful as *apartheid* and that millions of people held that view. Members of the Committee should try to understand each other's problems. Thus, the USSR delegation hoped that the Netherlands representative would show a spirit of comprehension and would not press for a vote on any proposal that might be construed as expressing disrespect for peoples which had waged a heroic struggle against nazism. All progressive people should take a common stand on important questions of principle, irrespective of their economic and social systems, the colour of their skins, their geographical origin, their religion, their political persuasion or their social class. He appealed to the representatives of the Netherlands, Lesotho and Costa Rica not to maintain their objections to his proposal. In a spirit of conciliation, his delegation would not insist that the word "nazism" should be inserted before "*apartheid*", so long as it was included in the phrase concerned.

31. Mr. AL-SHAWI (Iraq) said that his delegation was satisfied with the revised text of the draft resolution and would withdraw its amendment (A/C.3/L.1773), since the gist of it had been accepted. He welcomed the Byelorussian representative's suggestion and would vote for the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.1775), but would ask for a roll-call vote on that text.

32. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) thanked the sponsors for accepting the second of the amendments submitted by her delegation together with that of Mauritania (A/C.3/L.1789). Despite the fact that the paragraph in question had been inserted in the preamble instead of the operative part of the draft, the two delegations would withdraw that amendment. They would, however, maintain their first proposal; in order to make it more concise, they wished to amend the last part of the paragraph to read: "and of the duties which the exercise of their rights in itself imposes upon them".

33. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that his delegation wished to compliment the sponsors of the draft resolution on their flexibility, thanks to which it had been possible to work out a much more balanced and acceptable text.

34. His delegation still believed that the insertion of the word "nazism" in the last phrase of operative paragraph 8, as proposed by the USSR delegation, would be unduly restrictive. Perhaps the problem was a linguistic one: "nazism" might have a much wider meaning in Russian than in the Western languages, where the word was associated with a tragic period in the history of Germany, from which his own country, like many others, had suffered greatly at the time but did not suffer today. The term "totalitarian ideologies and practices" which he had proposed covered nazism, as well as all other totalitarian régimes. It might be argued that that wording also included *apartheid*, but on no account would his delegation want that term to be omitted, not only because it was already in the text, but also because it referred to an objectionable phenomenon. His delegation therefore maintained its proposal.

35. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) explained that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had not been able to accept the first United States amendment (A/C.3/L.1784), relating to the sixth preambular paragraph, because they believed it unnecessary to reiterate the urgency of joint and concentrated action by developing and developed countries in all spheres of economic and social life, but they had thought it essential to emphasize the inadequacy of the efforts of the developed countries in that regard. Nor had they been able to accept the fourth United States amendment, concerning operative paragraph 10 of the revised draft resolution because it tended to evade the crucial issue of the financial and other assistance for the developing countries that the developed countries should provide in response to the appeal of young people.

36. In the second of its amendments (A/C.3/L.1783), the Czechoslovak delegation sought to make a distinction between two groups of developed countries. Although the developing countries were fully aware where responsibility for colonial exploitation lay, the position they had adopted in connexion with the Second United Nations Development Decade in the Second Committee was to avoid discrimination on the grounds of the essentially moral issue of responsibility for their backwardness. The sponsors had therefore been unable to accept that Czechoslovak proposal. For similar reasons, they could not accept the amendment to the sixth preambular paragraph submitted by Argentina, Costa Rica, Panama and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1790, because it would have the effect of diverting attention from the vital issue of the obligation of the developed countries to contribute to the development efforts of the developing countries.

37. He welcomed the changes that the Byelorussian delegation had made in its amendment (A/C.3/L.1775). If that delegation would agree that reference should be made to "peoples still under racist, colonial or alien domination", Pakistan could vote for the amendment. It could also vote for the amendment of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.1792) if those delegations would agree to change the text of their proposed addition to operative paragraph 7 to read: "...and to that end, to take effective steps to combat propaganda in favour of unjust wars, as well as to curb racist, Nazi and similar ideologies". Finally, his delegation had no strong objection to the USSR proposal to include a reference to nazism in operative paragraph 8, and could vote for it if the reference were to "nazism and similar ideologies".

38. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could accept the Pakistan representative's compromise solution.

39. Mr. NASSER-ZIAYEE (Afghanistan) said that his delegation could vote for the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.1775) if the Pakistan sub-amendment was accepted.

40. Mr. PENTCHEV (Bulgaria) accepted the Pakistan sub-amendment to the proposal which his delegation had submitted jointly with the Czechoslovak delegation.

41. Mr. de Gaiffier D'HESTROY (Belgium) said he hoped that separate votes would be taken on all references to "Nazi" and "nazism".

42. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he could accept the Pakistan sub-amendment in a slightly modified form. A revised text of his amendment would be circulated in time for the next meeting.

43. Mrs. MOFOLO (Lesotho) said that her delegation appreciated the USSR representative's efforts to educate the Committee about nazism. The fact was that thousands of young men from Lesotho had died in action in the struggle against nazism, and many families in that country had been left without breadwinners. The single small word "nazism" had been rubbed into the battle scars of Lesotho; her country was fully aware of its meaning. Although nazism might still be operating under ground, the movement could be said to have ended with Hitler's death, and to attach so much importance to that movement would only serve to encourage clandestine groups. In any case, that issue would be discussed at length in connexion with agenda item 49; meanwhile, she wished to assure the USSR representative that Lesotho had never supported or condoned any racist evil and was prepared at all times to co-operate with the USSR in bringing about world peace.

44. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said she wished to exercise her right of reply with regard to the USSR representative's comments on her statement concerning his proposal. It was true that Costa Rica had fortunately had no direct experience of nazism; but although it had never had an army, since that was prohibited by its Constitution, it had openly declared itself against Hitler and his racist régime, had sided with the allies in their struggle and had made a modest contribution to combating nazism. Costa Rica had a perfectly clear conscience on that score, for it had never had any pact or relations of any kind with Nazi Germany. Perhaps a concept could not die, but the founders of nazism had died at the end of the Second World War. Her delegation was satisfied with the Netherlands representative's explanation of his sub-amendment to the USSR proposal and intended to vote for it, in the belief that it clarified and improved the text. A perusal of the Secretary-General's report on measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance (A/8056) showed that none of the twenty-seven States which had sent information indicated that there was any recrudescence of nazism; accordingly, adoption of the Netherlands sub-amendment would make the draft resolution more applicable to the existing situation.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*