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AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued)
(A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921, E/3873, chap. II
and annexes I and III; A/C.3/L.1208, L.1210,
L.1211, L.1217, L.1219 to L.1223, L.1225, L.1226

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted
by the delegations of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/
L.1244).

2. Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that his delegation
opposed the draft resolution because it considered
it essential that anti-Semitism, with which the entire
history and fate of every generation of the Jewish
people had been tragically bound up, should be
expressly mentioned in the draft Convention.

3. The history of the Jewish people was that of a
branch of the human family which had been singled
out for cruel hostility and savage persecution. Anti-
Semitism, which had assumed at different times
religious, racial, economic and cultural aspects,
was unfortunately not something which belonged to
the remote, past, for, after having reached its cul-
mminating horror in the twentieth century with the
atrocities of the Hitler régime, the declared aim of
which was to ensure the "final solution of the Jewish
question" by systematically exterminating all Jews
in cold blood, anti-Semitism had now become the
stock-in-trade of every political group aiming to
subvert democratic institutions and freedoms. It was
thus precisely because anti-Semitism continued to
exist in the world that it must be mentioned expressly
in the Convention.

4. In any case, it was difficult to conceive how the
Convention could pass over such a monstrous evil in
silence when it owed its origin to the manifestations
of anti-Semitism which had occurred in a number of
countries in 1959 and 1960. When the United Nations
had tackled the question of manifestations of anti-
Semitism and other forms of racial prejudice and
religious intolerance of a similar nature the general
consensus had been that anti-Semitism was not a
matter of religious intolerance alone and that it was
necessary to draft a separate convention dealing with
the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

5. The Israeli delegation was well aware that a
number of delegations opposed the enumeration of the
evils engendered by racial prejudice, but it wished to
point out that anti-Semitism would not be the only
evil to be expressly mentioned in the Convention, for
racial segregation and apartheid were referred to in
article III, which had been unanimously approved, and
there was a reference to colonialism in the preamble.

6. He wished to point out that anti-Semitism had not
only been a source of suffering for the Jews, but had
frequently been used to distract the attention of the
rest of the population from real social evils. The
nazi movement, in particular, had exploited anti-
Semitism as a way of sapping the resistance of the
peoples which it intended to conquer and which it
had eventually reduced to slavery after appalling
massacres. He was happy to see, in that connexion,
that a number of Governments and important Church
bodies were striving to put public opinion on its
guard against the evils of anti-Semitism; he had in
mind particularly the statement in which the Chair-
man of the Council of Ministers of the USSR had
called upon the population to oppose anti-Semitism
and the resolution against anti-Semitism which the
Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church was in
the process of adopting.

7. As far as the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.1231
and Corr.1) was concerned, his delegation considered
it totally unacceptable that that amendment should
bracket Zionism together with anti-Semitism, nazi-
sm and neo-nazism; whether that amendment had been
put forward for reasons of political opportunism or
in order so to complicate the work of the Committee
as to achieve the elimination from the Convention
of any reference to anti-Semitism, it was an affront
to Israel and to the Jewish people everywhere. Zionism
was the Jewish national movement which had given
birth to the State of Israel, and it was perhaps one of
the oldest movements for national self-determination.
It had been endorsed by the United Nations in 1947
when the General Assembly (resolution 181 (II) had
voted by an overwhelming majority for the restora-
tion of Jewish independence. It was worth recalling
that the Soviet Union had at that time fully associated
itself with the majority, thus endorsing Zionism, and
it was therefore difficult to understand why the Soviet
delegation was now trying to have Zionism condemned
in the Convention under consideration. Perhaps the
Soviet delegation was trying to deflect international
attention from the grave situation in the USSR, where
the Jewish population was being persecuted in matters
of religion, traditions, language and literature, and
was in a serious plight which had distressed
world public opinion, including many distinguished
personalities who could not be accused of any ill-will
towards the Soviet Union. While it was only fair to
say that some positive gestures had been made of late,
it had to be acknowledged also that the situation of
the Jewish community had scarcely improved.

8. The delegation of Israel protested in the strongest
terms against the Soviet amendment, which lumped
Zionism together with such evil and inhuman forces
as anti-Semitism and nazism, of which Jews were the
chief victims. It appealed to the Committee to give
its overwhelming support to the Bolivian amendment
and vote for the deletion of the word "Zionism" from
the Soviet proposal. The Committee could not adopt a
convention on the elimination of racial discrimination
without resolving specifically that enlightened
humanity must do everything in its power to eradicate
that evil and banish it from its midst forever.

9. Mrs. JIMENEZ (Cuba) said that while her delega-
tion condemned racial discrimination wherever it
manifested itself, it considered that the various
forms which such discrimination could assume should
be combined in some general expression lest some
forms be omitted. Her delegation would therefore
support unreservedly the draft resolution submitted
by Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244), which satis-
fied that requirement.

10. Mr. DARMAN (Somalia) also supported the draft
resolution because it sought to make the text of the
Convention of universal application and that goal
might be jeopardized if particular forms of racial
discrimination were expressly mentioned.

11. Mr. LAWREY (Australia) said that his delega-
tion would oppose the draft resolution submitted by
Greece and Hungary. It was moved by a strong feel-
ing that it would be wrong to allow the vicious and
irrational form of discrimination called anti-Semi-
tism to pass without specific condemnation.

12. Anti-Semitic activity was a concrete fact of
history. Through the centuries it had manifested
itself in many and often terrible forms as had been
recalled eloquently by the delegation of Israel. Pres-
tent times had seen Hitler's attempt not merely to
persecute but to exterminate Europe's Jewish com-
unities. Unhappily anti-Semitic attitudes and prac-
tices were not absent from the world of 1965, nor
were they so insignificant that they could be passed
over in silence or condemned merely by implication.

13. There had been some argument about the nature
of anti-Semitism. So far as the Australian delegation
was concerned it knew very well what anti-Semitism
was, it knew that it existed in the world today and it
believed that it should be condemned and eradicated.
Anti-Semitism was a form of discrimination against
—at its worst persecution of—human beings, not be-
cause of their acts, but because they had been born
Jews. So far as it took the form of banning or limit-
ating the practice of the religion of Judaism it was a
manifestation of religious intolerance, which Australia
deplored. But anti-Semitism was more than that. It
was an ever-present and particularly repugnant form
of racial discrimination.

14. The Australian delegation accordingly favoured
condemning anti-Semitism and of writing into the
draft Convention a provision for combating it.

15. Mr. ABDEL-RAHIM (Sudan) said that he had
listened with surprise to the Israeli representative's
remarks which depicted anti-Semitism as a universal
phenomenon, for while anti-Semitism certainly exist-
ited, it could not reasonably be claimed that it was rife
in all countries of the world. Racial discrimination,
and especially anti-Semitism, was virtually unknown
in Afro-Asian countries in general and certainly not in
the Arab and Moslem countries: a fact which had
traditionally been acknowledged even by Jewish
historians—at any rate till the rise of Zionism and the
State of Israel.

16. Since the birth of Zionism and of Israel, deter-
mined attempts had been made to depict the Arab
countries as being anti-Semitic, whereas in reality
those countries had always been havens for vic-
ims of persecution especially during the Middle Ages
when both Jews and Muslims were subjected to
various forms of persecution in different parts of
Europe. Although the traditional pattern of friendship
and understanding between Jews and Arabs had
recently been modified in certain respects it was
important to remember that the present conflict
between Jews and Arabs was in no way a manifesta-
tion of anti-Semitism but was in fact a war being
fought against Zionist imperialism. For the Arabs,
Israel was what South Africa was to the African
nationalists and Zionism was the equivalent of apartheid.

17. While it was quite true that the term anti-Semi-
tism normally referred to Jews and not to Arabs who
formed the great majority of Semites in the world it
was important to remember that the term had been
used and was still being used by different writers—
including some who were themselves Jewish but not
Zionist—in different senses and, especially, to indi-
cate, on the one hand, the prejudices which Jews of
oriental origin encountered in Israel and, on the
other hand, the hostility which existed in Israel
towards the Arabs. The Arabs, for their part, op-
posed Zionism as an ideology and Israel as a State,
but they were in no way anti-Semitic.

18. With regard to the origins of the Zionist move-
ment, of which the Israel representative had spoken,
he noted that it was religious Zionism which went
back to ancient times, not political Zionism, which
had begun in the nineteenth century and was a reaction
against anti-Semitism in Europe, which like the
colour bar was a phenomenon peculiar to European
civilization, and was alien to the African and Asian civilizations. In that connexion, it was interesting to note that the Zionist movement, the object of which was to solve the problem of anti-Semitism by the establishment of a Jewish national home, had not sought to achieve that solution at the expense of the peoples who had tried to wipe the Jews off the face of the earth, but at the expense of other peoples. It was well known that the leaders of the Zionist movement considered the establishment of their proposed Jewish State in East Africa and in South America before they finally decided to focus their attention on Palestine. And when they finally settled for Palestine the Zionists treated the Palestinian Arabs as atrociously as the Nazis had treated the Jews. While anti-Semitism was of course to be deplored, the fact of having been persecuted did not give the Jews the right to persecute the Palestinian Arabs or Jews of non-European origin. Israel, incidentally, had been repeatedly censured for acting in violation of United Nations resolutions, and for committing acts of violence against the Palestinian Arabs.

19. His delegation would support unreservedly the draft resolution presented by Greece and Hungary, not only because the Sudan condemned racial discrimination in all its forms, but also because it believed that a listing of the various forms of racial discrimination might weaken the Convention. Such a listing would be unwise not only because it would be difficult to draw up an exhaustive list, but also because there was no guarantee that other forms of racial discrimination might not one day emerge which would be automatically excluded from the scope of the Convention; the absence of the former from the Convention might in fact even give them a kind of implicit sanction. Moreover, as had been pointed out before, the differences of opinion to which any listing would give rise would be so great that the Committee would be unable to achieve unanimity; and unanimity was essential on a text of such importance as the Convention. In any event, in a legal document of that kind, the most important question was that of principle. And on the principle that all forms of racial discrimination must be abolished all the members of the Committee were agreed. The Convention should state unequivocally a universal principle which would apply to all forms of racial discrimination and would be equally valid for the past, the present and the future.

20. Mr. COMAY (Israel) speaking on a point of order, said that, while the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries was unfortunately an undeniable fact of contemporary history, it should not be referred to in the present debate. Hence, although he had felt obliged to explain the nature of Zionism—a question which had been brought up by delegations other than his own—he had carefully avoided any reference to that conflict.

21. Not to exacerbate the discussion, he would refrain from refuting—as he could very easily do—the arguments of the representative of the Sudan, who had hurled accusations against Israel which it was difficult not to answer.

22. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) observed that the Israeli representative, who had asked for the floor on a point of order, was overstepping his rights.

23. Mr. LAMPTHEY (Ghana) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure. He believed that to be the only means of preserving the spirit of harmony which was indispensable to the working of the Committee. His delegation was animated by a sincere desire to maintain the objectivity of the debate, and was not in any way seeking to deprive the representatives of sovereign States in the Committee of the right to speak. They would be able to express their views when explaining their vote.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 118, he would give the floor to two speakers opposing the closure.

25. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) drew the attention of the representative of Ghana to the fact that many delegations, including his own, far from wishing to exacerbate the debate, desired only to contribute usefully to it. In fact, as representatives of equal and sovereign States, they believed themselves entitled to take part in the debate.

26. If the representative of Ghana maintained his motion, he would be obliged to vote against it.

27. Mrs. VILLGRATNER (Austria) said that she agreed with the representative of Uruguay and opposed the closure of the debate.

The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 37 votes to 24, with 18 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, representatives would have an opportunity to explain their vote before or after the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244). Out of consideration for the speakers who had been unable to take the floor on account of the closure of the debate, he felt that it would be preferable to decide on the latter alternative.

29. Mrs. VILLGRATNER (Austria) said that she would prefer to speak before the vote.

30. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he too would prefer, as would probably many other delegations, to speak before the vote. The statement which he intended to make was directly related to the question on which the Committee was to vote.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he also would have liked to speak before the vote, but he agreed with the Chairman that it would be wiser to postpone the explanations of vote until afterwards. In that way, it would be possible to avoid the delays and last-minute attempts at persuasion, which, although understandable, were nevertheless liable to obscure the issue and delay its solution.

32. The CHAIRMAN proposed that explanations of vote should be given after the balloting. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 77 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary. In reply to a question by Mr. RIOS (Panama), he said that, should that draft be adopted, the following proposals would become
redundant: the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1210) and the oral amendment thereto proposed by Jordan at the 1301st meeting; part (b) of the second Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.3/L.1220) and the United States amendment thereto (A/C.3/L.1243); the proposal for a new article submitted by Brazil and the United States (A/C.3/L.1211), the amendment thereto by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/C.3/L.1231 and Corr.1) and the Bolivian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1230).

34. Mrs. SECONINOVA (Czechoslovakia) observed that her delegation’s amendment was sufficiently broad in scope to be maintained even in the event of the adoption of the draft resolution A/C.3/L.1244.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the Czechoslovak delegation itself would have to decide, after the vote on the draft resolution, whether to maintain its amendment in its existing form, or in an amended form.

At the request of the representative of Togo, the vote on the draft resolution of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244) was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria.

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Haiti, Italy, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Venezuela.

The draft resolution of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244) was adopted by 82 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.

36. Mr. CHKHKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished first to thank the African and Asian countries for their tireless efforts to achieve the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention. Indeed, the great majority of the Committee, guided by the Chairman’s example, had worked to that end in a remarkably co-operative spirit.

37. He regretted that the Israel representative, untouched by that evident spirit of goodwill, had tried, in the statement he had just made, to impede the adoption of the Convention, although that should represent the crowning of the Committee’s work.

38. The Israel delegation had decided to raise once again the question of anti-Semitism, as it, and the delegations which were in league with it, had so often done for various motives during the last fifteen years. In doing so, and, more specifically, in accusing the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism, the Israel representative had had four aims in mind. He had wished, if possible, to distract the Third Committee’s attention from its essential aim, which was the adoption of the draft Convention—a task in which his efforts had been facilitated by the attitude of certain Governments which, while giving lip service to the condemnation of discrimination, were not ready to legislate accordingly.

39. Failing that, his intention had been to make the adoption of the Convention more difficult by dividing the Committee. Moreover, by accusing the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism, the Israeli representative had hoped to distract the Committee’s attention from the acts of racial discrimination committed by certain imperialist and colonialist countries, in particular the United States of America. Finally, the manoeuvre had been aimed at helping the monopolies which were now preparing elections.

40. Needless to say, the Soviet Union vigorously condemned those cold-war tactics, which were indulged in not only by the Israel delegation but by all those which supported it. It would be better if those delegations had the courage of their convictions and came out clearly in favour of discrimination instead of resorting to such undermining activities.

41. He vigorously rejected the Israel representative’s accusations. The Soviet Union, in its relations with its constituent peoples, based its policy on the ideology of Lenin. In Lenin’s view, the Jewish workers were the brothers of all the other inhabitants of the Soviet Union in the struggle against their common enemy, capitalism. The Soviet Union did indeed make a distinction between those brothers in arms and the Zionists, but the Soviet Jews had a place of honour in the great family of peoples of the USSR.

42. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) said that he wished to explain his abstention during the three successive votes. He had been unable to support the motion for closing the debate because he had wished to take part in the substantive discussion; out of a spirit of solidarity he had not, however, cast a negative vote. In spite of his wish to express his point of view before the voting, he had found it difficult to vote against the Chairman’s proposal and had, for that reason, again abstained. He had abstained from the third vote because he could not approve the political turn which the discussion had taken.

43. He regretted that naziism, which had been the cause of the last world conflagration, was only referred to in circumlocutions, in particular in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft Convention. As its doctrines still had followers and were still openly based on the same ideologies, there should be no fear of calling things by their proper names.
44. He was convinced that the Convention should have condemned not only the doctrine but also the generally rejected practices of nazism, and regretted that considerations of expediency had prevented all delegations from adopting the same attitude. Some delegations had, indeed, referred to the difficulties that their parliaments would have in ratifying a convention containing the terms nazism and anti-Semitism. Although it wished to support the Afro-Asian countries, his delegation could not act in a way that was contrary to its deep convictions.

45. Mr. ROGERS (United States of America) had voted against the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution because his delegation was firmly convinced that anti-Semitism, which constituted a particularly dangerous form of racial discrimination, deserved special mention just as apartheid did. Thus, in conjunction with Brazil, his delegation had submitted an amendment to include in the Convention an article condemning anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism was one of the gravest and most persistent problems facing humanity, dating back over 2,000 years. Historically, it had been a barometer of the political health of States; where Jews had been unsafe, other minorities also soon found themselves in danger. That was what had happened in 1939. As a result of the explosion of anti-Semitism which the world had witnessed in 1959, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had called the General Assembly’s attention to the need for action. The Assembly had decided to prepare a declaration and a convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

46. During the last few months, there had been a degree of relaxation in some of the restrictions previously placed on Jewish life and Jewish worship. However, to suggest that those relaxations were as yet sufficient would be to ignore the fact that one country was still trying to stifle its Jewish population by preventing Jews from living according to their customs, depriving them of their schools, restricting their freedom of expression, forbidding Yiddish and Hebrew, and denying them their right to a nationality. Leading Jewish figures were not allowed to go abroad to take part in international meetings and ordinary Jewish citizens were denied their right to travel and settle in other lands.

47. It was to be hoped that after the stirring message of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, and the recent decision of the Ecumenical Council on the subject of the Jews, the situation of Jews throughout the world would continue to improve. In view of His Holiness’s message and the decision of the Ecumenical Council, he regretted that the Committee had failed to take the opportunity offered it to condemn anti-Semitism by an overwhelming majority. However, it was clear that there was a general feeling condemning anti-Semitism and that anti-Semitism was covered by the terms of the Convention. The United States delegation remained attached to the principles of the Convention and would express its views on the plague of anti-Semitism in other United Nations organs.

48. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) had voted in favour of closing the discussion, not because he wished to prevent some delegations from expressing their point of view, but in a spirit of conciliation. He wished to exercise his right of reply and at the same time to make clear the meaning of his vote.

49. The term anti-Semitism was a specifically European one and he did not see why Europe should impose its way of thinking on the rest of the world. In Saudi Arabia Jews and Arabs were brothers and had the same customs and the same dietary habits. Africa and Asia had never known pogroms or ghettos; it was thus Europe which was hostile to the Jews. Nor must race be confused with religion: one should speak not of anti-Semitism but of anti-Judaism. Catholicism was also a Semitic religion, just as Islam was, so that anti-Semitism could be understood to mean any hostility to a black Mohammedan or a Scandinavian Christian.

50. Moreover, many Jews were loyal to the countries of which they were nationals and identified themselves not with Israel but with the countries in which they had always lived, just as the 20 million Negroes in the United States of America considered themselves to be Americans and not Africans.

51. He regretted that during the debate problems of a religious nature had served as a pretext for a renewal of the cold war, and considered that the United States had wished to exert pressure on the Soviet Union to allow Jews to leave its territory, when perhaps they did not even wish to do so.

52. He did not see by what right Israel claimed to represent the Jews of the whole world. There was no State which could set itself up as a spokesman for Islam either, as Islam was a religion and not a nationality and each sovereign State spoke in its own name.

53. After reviewing the evolution of the Palestine question during the First World War, he recalled the creation of a Jewish national home and the British Mandate, and described how the United Nations had been seized of the question, now, in the name of the Charter, it had recognized the right of the Jewish people to self-determination, and the circumstances in which it had decided upon the partition of Palestine, a decision which had been taken by a very narrow majority, thanks to the change of attitude of the Philippines and Liberia and, in his opinion, to the influence of certain pressure groups.

54. All States were free to condemn anti-Semitism and to adopt appropriate legislation if they so desired, but that was not the role of an international organization. He regretted that old wounds had been reopened and warned the Committee of the risk of rekindling passions which might again expose Jews who were loyal to their country of origin to becoming victims of racial hatred.

55. Mr. MOMMERSTEEG (Netherlands) had voted against the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution because, although he would have preferred that no form of racial discrimination should be mentioned in the text of the Convention, once article III, which expressly condemned apartheid, had been unanimously adopted, he saw no reason for not making a similar allusion to anti-Semitism. In memory of the 100,000 Netherlanders of Jewish descent who had perished
19. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) agreed with the representative of Panama. The right to freedom of association mentioned in sub-paragraph (g) (ix) covered the case of cultural associations, and Argentina, where there were many such associations, would have no difficulty in accepting the text drafted by the Commission on Human Rights.

20. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) agreed that the existing text was adequate and clear. Moreover, details of the kind proposed in the amendment were not normally included in international conventions, but were spelt out in domestic law.

21. Mr. DOE (Liberia) also supported the existing text. In his view the notion of participation included organization and the proposed addition was therefore redundant.

22. Mr. K. C. PANT (India) remarked that, although he had originally considered the proposed addition unnecessary, he now felt that there was a genuine difference between the right to participate in cultural activities on an individual basis and the right to organize cultural associations. The Committee should try to accommodate the views of the sponsors of the amendment.

but might result in an unsatisfactory Convention.

30. Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) said that he would have agreed to any text which was satisfactorily drafted. However, he would vote against the three-Power amendment, as orally revised, and in favour of the wording submitted by the Commission on Human Rights.

31. Mr. COMBAL (France) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Senegal and Italy, and urged the retention of the original text, which fully covered the intention of the sponsors of the amendment.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on article V and the amendments thereto.

The Czechoslovak oral amendment, as revised, to insert the word "national" in the introductory paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.

Paragraphs (a) and (b) were adopted unanimously.

The second Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1218), as orally revised, was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

during the war, he had considered it his duty to take a firm stand in favour of an explicit condemnation of anti-Semitism. He respected the point of view of those delegations which thought otherwise, but failed to understand why the withdrawal of all the amendments had been linked to the withdrawal of the amendment condemning anti-Semitism and anti-Semitism alone. A vote in favour of the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution might have been interpreted as a refusal to condemn anti-Semitism, or at least as a mark of indifference and therefore, because it did not wish to minimize the magnitude of that scourge, the Netherlands delegation had cast a negative vote.

56. The Netherlands delegation deplored the fact that the substantive debate had been prematurely closed and would at least have liked, like the Uruguayan and Austrian delegations, to have been able to speak before the vote.

57. Mr. ROGERS (United States of America) reserved his right to reply at a later date.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.