



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Statement by the Chairman.....	169
Agenda item 58:	
Draft international covenants on human rights (<i>continued</i>)	169

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a telegram from Mr. Ramadan, Acting Chairman of the Permanent Delegation of Egypt to the United Nations, expressing the gratitude of the Egyptian Government for the unanimous expression of sympathy from the Third Committee on the occasion of the death of Mr. Mahmoud Azmi.

AGENDA ITEM 58

**Draft international covenants on human rights
(A/2714, A/2686, chapter V, section I, E/2573,
A/C.3/574) (*continued*)**

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

2. Mr. PEREZ DE ARCE (Chile) said that he was fully aware of the responsibility incumbent on the United Nations in the matter of human rights and recalled the part played by his delegation in the preparation of the draft covenants (E/2573, annex I). The Third Committee should now consider the question on a high plane and show a spirit of conciliation in order to accomplish the important task that had been entrusted to it. The draft covenants, like all human works, were imperfect, but they had the merit of clearly acknowledging the rights and freedoms of the human person and of showing the way towards the ideal of justice and human solidarity which the world should endeavour to make a reality.

3. Those considerations had led the Chilean Government to the conclusion that reservations should be avoided. It had always considered that the covenants should deal with all the rights for which the Members of the United Nations should ensure respect in the countries under their administration, whether those were metropolitan countries or territories that were not yet self-governing. Reservations might open the way for evasion of responsibility. As social legislation in Chile was very advanced, his delegation had naturally come to take a leading place in the defence of human rights; it felt that the covenants as they stood were in conformity with Chilean tradition and legislation and

that any new amendment or reservation could only restrict their scope.

4. With regard to the territorial application clause, stress had been laid on the fact that the application of the covenants by metropolitan States to the territories under their jurisdiction might be difficult, owing to the systems in force in some of those territories and to the existence of inaccessible regions beyond the control of the central government. The Chilean delegation believed that if the rights enumerated in the draft could not be effectively enforced, they should in any case be recognized by law in order that their progressive application might be ensured in all countries, due consideration being given to the differences between various legal systems. The main point was that nations should have the intention of conforming with the provisions of the covenants.

5. With regard to measures of implementation, the Chilean delegation approved of the system of periodic reports.

6. In connexion with the federal clause, the importance of the principle of universality should be stressed. It would be anomalous for unitary States acceding to the covenants to undertake to ensure their integral application while exceptional measures were provided for federal States.

7. He had listened carefully to the comments on article 1 of both draft covenants; his delegation was glad that it had supported the article and had participated in the drafting of paragraph 3. The allegation had been made that the right in question was not an individual right but a right of peoples and nations. The covenants were specifically intended, however, to protect the collective rights of the individuals who made up a particular people or nation. In the economic sphere, every human group had the right to enjoy the national resources of the country in which it lived and from which it derived its means of subsistence, and the special rights of aliens could in no case infringe that sovereign right. The United States representative had expressed the view that the recognition of that principle might constitute an abuse of the right of property. He wished to reassure her in that regard and to state that his delegation could not support a proposal which would result in a violation of the right of property. Chile recognized that right both for its nationals and for aliens and in no way underestimated the importance of foreign investments. Many undertakings belonging to United States nationals were being carried on in Chile; expropriation was the subject of specific regulation, and compensation was provided. The Chilean delegation had always urged that an article on the right of property, possibly based on article XXIII of the Inter-American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man adopted at Bogotá in 1948, should be included in the draft covenant on economic, social and cultural rights.

It had even submitted a draft article along those lines (E/2573, paras. 50 and 51).

8. With regard to the right of petition, the Chilean delegation favoured the joint proposal by Chile, Egypt, the Philippines and Uruguay (E/2573, para. 229).

9. With regard to the various social rights enumerated in the covenants, Chilean legislation was very progressive, although its labour code and regulations did place some restrictions on the number of alien workers and employees who could work in Chile.

10. His delegation had nothing to say on the question whether there should be one covenant or two. Two instruments had been submitted to the Third Committee and had to be examined. Nevertheless, he agreed with the Costa Rican representative that human rights were indivisible.

11. In conclusion, he expressed the conviction that the United Nations would be inspired by the dictum of the great Uruguayan thinker, Rodó: "To reform oneself is to live."

12. Mr. METALL (International Labour Organisation) recalled that the Economic and Social Council at its eighteenth session had received observations on the draft covenants made by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office in May 1954 (E/2621). The Governing Body had noted with satisfaction that the Commission on Human Rights had, to a large extent, taken into account the views expressed by the Governing Body on the implementation of the covenant on economic, social and cultural rights. It trusted that the provisions inserted in that covenant as a result of its observations would be approved by the General Assembly.

13. With regard to the implementation of the draft covenant on civil and political rights, the Governing Body had noted that the article whereby the competence of the human rights committee would be limited so as to safeguard that of the other international organizations, in particular the International Labour Organisation, did not appear in the text before the Third Committee (E/2573, annex I). It wished again to draw the attention of the Third Committee to the value of that former article and was gratified to note the favourable opinion in that regard expressed during the current debate by several members of the Committee.

14. With regard to the system of reports provided for the implementation of the covenants, the Governing Body noted certain differences between the two covenants as regards participation by the specialized agencies in the reporting system; an analysis of those differences was set forth in the document that he had mentioned. In so far as the reporting system in itself was concerned, the Governing Body considered and had already stated that, with a view to preventing any possibility of duplication, the clauses concerning the reports on implementation should be the same in both covenants.

15. Mr. TERENCE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) considered that the articles on educational and cultural rights were satisfactory and that the procedure suggested for the submission of progress reports on those questions duly recognized the responsibilities of the specialized agencies.

16. He wished, however, on the basis of observations by the Executive Board of UNESCO, to make a few comments on article 49 of the draft covenant on civil

and political rights. As the provisions in that draft relating to freedom of information and freedom of expression were of interest to UNESCO, he would like to say a few words concerning implementation. He agreed with the ILO representative that the procedure for the submission of reports should be the same in both covenants and that the provisions of article 49 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights should accordingly be brought into harmony with the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the draft covenant on economic, social and cultural rights. Moreover, the specialized agencies should be invited to submit to the human rights committee written statements on matters within their special competence, and an article to that effect could be drafted along the lines of Article 66, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

17. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) stated that he had wanted to hear the members of the Commission on Human Rights before speaking and now wished to state the position of his delegation.

18. With regard to the right of property, he pointed out that there were considerable differences of opinion with regard to the concept of property. In the modern world, that concept was viewed from different angles, being regarded, for example, as jointly held or strictly personal property or as property that was used or property that was not used. In some countries, the sacred character of property was stressed and in others, its social character. Widely varying opinions had existed, not only in different countries but also at different periods with regard to some types of property, such as property of ideas. Very different attitudes could be noted also with regard to the restrictions imposed on the right of property. In some cases, taxes, particularly inheritance taxes, reduced property to almost nothing. Because of the recognized social function of property, heavy taxes were levied on property that was used only partly or not at all. In view of so many divergencies, he doubted the advisability of inserting any article on the right of property in the draft covenants. He thought, moreover, that the wish to codify the right to property in an article had a psychological origin, namely, the feeling of security given by the possession of a thing even when it was not used. It was, however, in that particular regard that the social function of property should be stressed. If the increase of population was considered in the light of ownership of the land, there were grounds for anxiety. The population of the world might double within half a century. Although it was still possible to reclaim land, the area of the earth was limited and the time would come when further expansion would be impossible. According to the ecologists, the balance between land yield and human consumption was not being maintained, with the result that there were famines.

19. In the light of those considerations, he felt that an article on the right of property would only cause further complications. If that right were not mentioned, the various countries would continue to apply their own laws, each according to its own economic structure, and he felt that, in view of the complexity of the problem, it was better to leave the matter there.

20. Turning to the question of reservations, he said that the representatives of Yugoslavia and New Zealand had made very constructive suggestions. The Yugoslav representative had said that the desired reservations might perhaps be introduced into the covenants merely

by amending certain articles, without any further articles being required. The New Zealand representative, on the other hand, had very judiciously pointed out that without certain reservations, some States, because of their national legislation or the internal situation in their countries, might not be able to accede to the covenants. He felt that the proposal submitted by China, Egypt, Lebanon and the Philippines (E/2573, annex II, A) might provide a compromise and should be very carefully considered.

21. With regard to implementation, he did not think that the establishment of a high commissioner's office would be a satisfactory solution. A high commissioner, whatever his qualities, would always be a human being and therefore fallible. Furthermore, as he would necessarily belong to one of the cultural systems represented in the United Nations, he might be led to take decisions without giving sufficient weight to the problems that might exist in countries belonging to other systems.

22. With regard to the proposed human rights committee, he thought that such a body might serve a useful purpose but he did not regard the proposed form as ideal. He would favour the establishment, in each country, of a supra-national committee which would report annually to the human rights committee on the action it had taken to promote the observance of human rights. The members of those committees, who would be persons of high integrity, could be elected, for instance, by the legislature of each country. Those bodies would make representations to their respective governments if rights were violated, and if the governments persisted in their attitude, the committees would, at an annual conference to which they would all send representatives, contemplate what action might be taken to remedy the situation. In his opinion, such a system would be more effective than the one whereby the proposed human rights committee would be responsible for dealing with any infringements of rights, as the States parties to the covenant would be sovereign States and the committee would not be able to impose any obligation on them. He felt that the human rights committee should be in the nature of a court of appeal. He did not, however, wish to submit a formal proposal and was merely putting forward a suggestion.

23. With regard to the federal clause, he believed that the application of the covenants in federal States did raise some real problems. A federal State was made up of various constituent parts which had voluntarily and freely agreed to federate. In the past, there had been many instances where federal Governments had used their influence to introduce liberal and democratic measures into all their constituent parts, but there were real difficulties. The Saudi Arabian delegation had already abstained on several occasions from taking a stand in the matter, because it recognized the difficulties encountered by federal States even though at the same time it understood the position of the unitary States which defended the principle of universality. He felt that the difficulties might be overcome if the federal States were given a period of time in which to attempt to bring the legislation of their constituent parts into line with the provisions of the covenants.

24. He emphasized that his observations with regard to the federal clause did not in any way apply to the territorial clause. A federation was a freely accepted association of States, but the colonial Powers had imposed their will on the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Colonies had arisen through such varied

means as transfers of power, expropriation, outright conquest, annexation, and treaties with weak governments, but in any case the peoples of the territories concerned had never been consulted and colonial status had been imposed on them. It was sometimes asserted that they were primitive peoples, but such a consideration could not in any way absolve the colonial Powers from their obligation to further the advancement of those peoples in all fields. Moreover, some of the colonized peoples had a civilization far superior to that of their conquerors. The colonial Powers maintained, on the other hand, that the territorial clause could not be applied because some of its provisions might clash with the constitutions of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was well known, however, that in most cases a colony's constitution had been drawn up by the Administering Power itself with the consent, not of the population, but of a puppet government appointed by the administering Power.

25. He did not see why there should be any objection to the insertion of paragraph 3 in article 1 of the draft covenants (E/2573, annex I), since that paragraph actually justified those that preceded it. The truth was that the delegations opposed to it feared that natural resources would be nationalized. Nationalization was perfectly justified and expropriation would give the right to compensation. If nationalization were barred, the major Powers would stifle the small countries economically by using methods similar to those of the colonialists. Apart from traditional colonialism, there were other less obvious and more modern methods. If the major Powers did not apply those methods but allowed other countries to exploit their own resources, there would be no more disagreement.

26. He approved of the suggestion for the insertion of a provision for a periodic examination of the covenants, possibly every ten years. Nobody knew whether the application of the covenants would be satisfactory. After five or ten years it would be easier to see the defects and take steps to remedy them in the light of the experience of the various Governments. A special conference might be convened for that purpose. That suggestion was worth considering and should be examined at the next session of the General Assembly.

27. The decision to draft two covenants (General Assembly resolution 543 (VI)) had been taken by only a very small majority. The Saudi Arabian delegation did not approve of it, believing that economic, social and cultural rights could not be dissociated from civil and political rights. Millions of persons suffering from famine were only told about freedom but were not given any possibility of immediately exercising their economic and social rights. Revolution was stalking the earth because millions lacked the essentials of life. History showed that attempts had been made to divert attention by stirring up international conflict, and even civil war. It was asserted that the individual rights were being defended, but they were to be put into effect only gradually. That solution was unacceptable at a time when the world was tired of waiting and the smaller countries were burning to take action in order to have their rights respected. They could not do so at the current time, because the major Powers controlled the sources of raw materials and the markets. Those Powers should realize the part they had been called upon to play and should see that it was in their own interest to respect the economic rights of the smaller countries and to share their prosperity with them. If they did so,

their wealth could not but increase and prosperity would become general. Economic, social and cultural rights could not be separated from civil and political rights and, if a new world conflict were to be avoided, all those rights should be embodied in a single draft covenant.

28. The CHAIRMAN announced that the general discussion was ended. He called on representatives who had asked to exercise the right of reply under rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

29. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished first of all to thank the representatives who had supported the USSR delegation's suggestion to include additional provisions in the draft covenants on human rights (E/2573, annex I). He hoped that those suggestions would be adopted, for they would make it possible to correct some of the existing defects in the texts. He was reverting to certain points only because other representatives had alluded to the views expressed on them by the Soviet delegation.

30. Some delegations had raised objections to the provisions on education, child labour, health and so forth which had been drafted with the participation of the Soviet delegation. The deletion of those important provisions had been proposed on the ground that they were too detailed and that the specialized agencies should be left to deal with such matters. Those proposals denoted a dangerous trend and would result in weakening the draft covenants. The specialized agencies were inter-governmental organizations and their relations with the United Nations were determined by the Charter and by agreements. There was no objection to their concerning themselves with matters within their competence. They reported to the United Nations and helped it in its work, but neither the United Nations Charter nor the agreements made any provision for them to replace the United Nations. He pointed out that the provisions to which certain delegations objected had in fact been adopted at the instance of the specialized agencies themselves. The contention that there might be some duplication between the measures provided for in the draft covenants and the activities of the specialized agencies was untenable.

31. His delegation had participated in drafting the provisions against all types of discrimination and on the prohibition of all propaganda for national, racial and religious hostility. During the general discussion some representatives had stated their opposition to the inclusion of such provisions in the draft covenants and had alleged that that would constitute a superfluous repetition. The representatives of the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Poland, among others, had shown that that argument was untenable. The United States delegation had advanced a new argument against those provisions. The United States representative had stated that she was opposed to the inclusion of article 14 in the draft covenant on economic, social and cultural rights, because it would infringe freedom of opinion and would be tantamount to a general control of all means of expression. She had also contended that the words "national, racial or religious hostility" and other terms used in article 26 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights could not be defined. The Soviet Union delegation could not agree. The sufferings caused by the racial theories of the Nazi criminals were well known, and the world had already paid too dearly for that so-called freedom of expression. There should be inserted in the draft covenants an additional provision to the effect that freedom of expression could in no

circumstances authorize the spreading of war-mongering propaganda, incitement to hostility among nations, racial discrimination and the dissemination of slanderous information. Freedom of expression should be restricted in certain cases, as it was in many countries, including the United States of America. Thus, for example, the use of information media to disseminate obscene matter or publications was prohibited, and that prohibition was the subject to an international convention. In that case, however, it was not alleged that a limitation of freedom of information was involved, while such assertions were made only against proposals for the prohibition of war propaganda and racial and national hostility.

32. The United States representative had not confined herself to speaking of the draft covenants; she had alluded to other matters not directly relevant to the subject under discussion. In particular, she had misrepresented the position of the USSR with regard to the right of self-determination and quoted, in support, a statement from J. V. Stalin in distorted form and taken out of its historical context. By making such incorrect assertions, the United States representative apparently wanted to weaken, by however little, the significance of the fact that the USSR had freed all the non-Russian peoples of the former Russian Empire and had constantly promoted their economic and social progress, as the representatives of the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR had stated; secondly, the Soviet Union had consistently supported on the international plane the right of peoples and nations to self-determination and other progressive provisions, some of which had been included in the draft covenants before the Committee. Stalin had pointed out the fact that the Revolutionary Government could never have defeated the White armies if it had not had the benefit of the sympathetic support of the peoples it had freed from the yoke.

33. Not wishing to bring in irrelevant matter, he would abstain from answering other false allegations made by the United States representative and would not expatiate on the real motives actuating the United States' avowed hostility to the draft covenants when the contents of those instruments were not yet known, since nothing should distract the Third Committee's attention from its important work. He wished to point out incidentally that when he had stated that he reserved the right of reply after the United States representative's speech, he had said a few words concerning substance. Those remarks had not appeared in the provisional summary record of the 568th meeting. He had sent the necessary corrigendum to the Secretariat. That had been a regrettable omission; the statements of members of the Committee should be reproduced in the records, and no one was entitled to decide whether or not the statement of any representative should be included in the summary record.

34. Several delegations had objected to the existing text of the federal clause which the Commission on Human Rights had adopted on the proposal of the USSR; they had suggested its replacement by the article proposed by Australia and India as amended by Belgium (E/2573, paras. 246 and 247). Under international law, when a federal State concluded a treaty with another State, the rights and duties to which the treaty gave rise applied to its territory as a whole. Furthermore, a federal State should not be favoured at the expense of other States; such inequality of treat-

ment would contravene the principles of the sovereign equality of States. Under the provisions of the article proposed by Australia, India and Belgium, federal authorities would not assume any real obligation when they signed the covenants, since all that they would have to do would be to bring certain provisions to the knowledge of the constituent units of the federation, to whom the decision would be left. Consequently, it was essential that the federal State clause should be retained as it stood.

35. He believed that his explanations would usefully supplement the statements that he had made previously.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the departments of the Secretariat responsible for the summary records would make every effort to give satisfaction to the Soviet representative.

37. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) wished to make a statement of principle, though with no aggressive intent. It was true that the Third Committee should not embark on theological or religious discussions, but freedom of religion was a human right just like other freedoms and the representatives of Christian countries considered it necessary to enlarge upon a point which was important to them. Some statements that had been made on article 18 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights (E/2573, annex I) could be interpreted as favouring serious restrictions on the freedom to change one's religion, contrary to the Christian philosophy, which was based on the principle of free will. Christianity was a universal religion and the church had received from its founder the task of teaching all nations. Article 18, paragraph 2, recognized a right with two aspects, the right of the Christians to preach their doctrine and the right of the peoples to listen to their preaching if they so desired. The issue was not one of theology but affected one of the fundamental freedoms of the human being. Moreover, article 19 laid down that every person had the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas. Christianity could not be refused the opportunity of making its message known throughout the earth.

38. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) wished to deal with some misunderstandings which might have arisen as to her delegation's position. Without discussing further the question whether self-determination was a principle or a right, individual or collective, she wished to reply briefly to the Syrian representative. The United Kingdom Government neither ignored nor regarded with indifference the rise of nationalism in many countries. It did not think, however, that the difficult problems involved would be solved or helped by article 1 of both draft covenants (E/2573, annex I). It was President Wilson, whose authority and enthusiasm for the principle could hardly be doubted, who had stated that the application of self-determination might be subordinate to that of other principles, particularly the maintenance of peace and she had merely quoted that recognized authority. The representative of Greece had said that whereas President Wilson had been thinking specifically of the European minorities, in modern times only the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were concerned. If self-determination were a universal principle it did not seem possible to contend that among the minorities which still existed in many areas there was none to whom the principle could properly be applied. Such an argument appeared to deny the universality of the principle.

39. The representative of Iraq had expressed doubt whether the provisions on equality before the laws which article 24 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights prescribed, could be put into immediate operation in some under-developed countries and in Non-Self-Governing Territories. But it was hard to see where the difficulty lay. The very conception of justice required that the law should be applied in the same way to everyone without any distinction, and that was certainly the case in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

40. The Philippine representative had referred to the United Kingdom delegation's observations on the second sentence of article 24 concerning the prohibition by law of all types of discrimination. In fact, that provision was not limited to the field of human rights at all and extended to every form of behaviour that constituted discrimination. She had mentioned the case of foreign workers as an illustration only. It appeared that the Philippine representative regarded the control of foreigners as a necessary corollary of the right of self-determination. It seemed extremely doubtful whether article 1 could be invoked in that way, and, in any event, it was very undesirable to make the application of article 24 dependent on an interpretation of another article which dealt with quite another subject. Accordingly, article 24 required careful examination from the point of view of its legal consequences when the time came to consider the draft covenants in detail.

41. The Pakistan representative had pointed out the impossibility of applying to religious minorities laws which they would not be able to accept because of their beliefs. Very similar considerations applied to the question of the abolition by law of those discriminatory practices which were manifested in social conduct. Laws should be strictly enforced, and laws which could not be enforced should not be enacted. Some deplorable forms of discrimination were based on social attitudes which could only be eliminated over a long period and by a process of education.

42. The representative of the Byelorussian SSR had stated that the United Kingdom was asking for a territorial application clause because of the backwardness of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. In point of fact, the true reasons were constitutional. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the United Kingdom was promoting the development of those Territories towards self-government; in the Gold Coast, for instance, the people had just elected a parliament. Most of the legislative or other measures contemplated in the draft covenant were within the domestic competence of the Territories, which could not be committed without being consulted and without their consent. The United Kingdom representative was grateful to the Lebanese representative for recognizing that that constitutional difficulty existed and had to be met, though she did not necessarily endorse the particular method which he had suggested for meeting it. The Saudi Arabian representative had stated that the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories could be explained only in historical terms, ignoring the fact that the administering Powers had accepted and were carrying out the obligations set forth in the Charter. Their constitutional difficulties were in fact very much the same as those of federal States. Those were the reasons why the United Kingdom wished to see a territorial application clause included.

43. In conclusion, she stressed the value of the general debate. For the first time delegations had been able to give a clear indication of their position with regard to the draft covenants. There had been a cleavage of opinion on many issues, but a spirit of understanding had prevailed. There seemed to be fairly general agreement on three points: first, that the existing provision relating to federal States would require further consideration; secondly, that the covenants should make provision for reservations, subject to adequate safeguards; and thirdly, that an article on the right of property should be included in the covenants. The United Kingdom delegation hoped that the Committee would continue its discussion in the atmosphere of tolerance and understanding which had marked its past debates.

44. Mrs. LORD (United States of America) explained that she had tried in her previous intervention to illustrate the difficulty of reaching agreement on various aspects of the covenants. She wished to cite some Soviet sources to justify her statements. She had said that in Soviet terminology the word "democracy" meant "communism". Lenin had said in *Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution* that the Soviet system represented the maximum of democracy, that is, dictatorship of the proletariat. Stalin had said in *On the Draft Constitution of 1936* that the Constitution of the USSR was the only thoroughly democratic constitution in the world and that it preserved the dictatorship of the working class and the leading position of the Communist Party. The conclusions to be drawn from those quotations was that in the USSR real democracy equaled Soviet communism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

45. She had said that the word "freedom" in the USSR meant "freedom to act only in the interests of communism". Article 125 of the Constitution of the USSR confirmed that opinion. The reality of the limi-

tations on freedom was confirmed in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of 17 August 1954, which quoted a resolution by the Presidium of the Board of the Union of Soviet Writers pointing out that the Communist Party's instructions were that all artistic work should be constantly guided by the policy of the Party and the State.

46. She had said that individual rights did not exist in the USSR, but only the right of the collectivity as determined by the Communist Party. The USSR Constitution nowhere limited the power which the State wielded over the individual, and the terminology used was itself revealing. The official theory was that there was never any divergence between the interests of the State and those of the individual. An article that had appeared in September 1947 in the publication *Partinaya Zhena* made it clear that that correlation was possible only on the basis of the subordination of personal interests to the interests of society. Stalin had made it clear that the Communist Party held all the powers of the State, in *Three Basic Slogans of Party on Peasant Questions*. Thus the individual was subordinated to the society and the society to the Party, which was controlled by a few people under the principle of centralism.

47. Finally, she had said that the USSR subordinated the principle of self-determination to the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In his "Speech to the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party", Stalin had explicitly stated that if a conflict arose between the right of self-determination and the higher right of the working class to its own dictatorship, the former had to yield to the latter.

48. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reserved his right to reply at the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.