

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1506th
MEETING

Monday, 6 November 1967,
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 54:

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:

(b) *Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued)*

Preamble (continued) 217

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Nettel (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 54

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:

(b) Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued) (A/6660 and Corr.1, A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. V; A/C.3/L.1456 to 1458, A/C.3/L.1463, A/C.3/L.1464, A/C.3/L.1469, A/C.3/L.1470, A/C.3/L.1475, A/C.3/L.1479)

PREAMBLE (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations wishing to do so to explain their votes on the various paragraphs of the preamble (A/C.3/L.1479).

2. Mr. CHAVERRI (Costa Rica), explaining why he had voted against the Nigerian-Soviet Union amendment (A/C.3/L.1474) adding a new paragraph to the end of the preamble, said that his delegation had stated its position on colonialism during the general debate and all its policies were indicative of its anti-colonialist convictions. Costa Rica also condemned any kind of racist policy. However, his delegation had been unable to support the proposed changes because it felt that a reference to the problems peculiar to a specific period in history might impair the universality which an international convention should possess. Moreover, the mention in the Convention of a phenomenon which was not of a religious character would increase the danger that the Convention might be used for purposes alien to it. The Convention might even encourage the emergence of new forms of religious intolerance. Since the purpose of the Convention was to guarantee a fundamental right, the only legitimate restrictions that could be imposed were those necessitated by considerations of morality and the maintenance of law and order. Moreover, there were United Nations organs which had special responsibility for studying the problem of colonialism, and where racialism was concerned,

an International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination had been adopted in 1965.

3. His delegation had intended to support the Argentine sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1472/Rev.1), and later, when they had been withdrawn, the Italian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1477), which, although not entirely satisfactory from the technical and legal standpoints, had the merit of preserving the universality proper to an instrument that was designed to protect human rights. Since Argentina had withdrawn its sub-amendments and the Italian sub-amendment had been rejected, he had had to vote against the Nigerian-Soviet Union amendment. He regretted that all the delegations which had voted against that amendment had been accused of being pro-colonialist. He also regretted that the previous meeting had taken place in an atmosphere of confusion, and hoped that the Committee would be able to continue its work under calmer conditions.

4. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that what the Committee must endeavour to protect was the future interest of the international community. The Convention should not be used to embarrass some groups of countries or to further anyone's own particular interests. When the Commission on Human Rights had discussed the draft Convention, her delegation had stressed the need for the preamble to mention only those principles which were directly related to the purposes of the Convention. Those were the considerations that had determined her delegation's position in the vote on the various paragraphs of the preamble. She had voted in favour of the Italian sub-amendment, which was largely a reiteration of the provisions of article XI and of the terminology of the Charter of the United Nations. However, she had not entirely agreed with that sub-amendment because article XI was a guarantee clause, and no limiting clauses should be introduced into the preamble unless they were absolutely necessary. Moreover, many abuses had been committed in the name of territorial integrity and friendly relations among nations, and, in her delegation's view, the presence of a saving clause on that subject might be used as an excuse for policies the principles and purposes of which would be far removed from those of the United Nations. Despite those reservations, her delegation had voted in favour of the Italian sub-amendment, and it regretted that some delegations had misconstrued the sub-amendment and had tried to defeat it through procedural tactics.

5. Her delegation had voted against the Nigerian-Soviet Union amendment adding a new paragraph to the end of the preamble. She strongly objected to

statements alleging that delegations which had voted against that amendment were secretly in sympathy with the champions of colonialism. Jamaica, which had been a colony for 453 years, could not be suspected of pro-colonialist sentiments. The colonization of Jamaica had begun with an act of genocide, and the country had experienced the most brutal forms of slavery for two centuries. The Jamaican Government therefore fought for decolonization, both in the United Nations and regionally. Nevertheless, it could see no reason for mentioning the problems of decolonization in a convention aimed at protecting freedom of religion, and it did not feel that the Nigerian-Soviet Union amendment strengthened the text. Since the Convention was to become an international instrument, some consideration should be given to the possible consequences of that modification. She also deplored any reference to racialism in the Convention because, while it was true that in a few cases religions encouraged racialism, that was too limited a phenomenon to be given a place in an international convention. However, it would be quite wrong to conclude that Jamaica favoured racialism; such insinuations did not even deserve an answer.

6. With regard to the amendments of the sixteen Powers (A/C.3/L.1468/Rev.1), she had also voted against the second amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble, replacing the words "to practise religion as well as to manifest a belief" by the words "of religion or belief", because she thought that it was not enough to guarantee freedom of conscience and that true freedom of religion consisted precisely in ensuring that everyone was able to express his faith or his convictions freely and in public.

7. She had also voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1476), even though in principle she condemned foreign interference in internal affairs of other States, because she believed that that sub-amendment introduced into the preamble considerations which were out of place there.

8. The preamble which the Committee had adopted was most disappointing; the cause of human rights deserved to be better served. A comparison of the preamble of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination with the preamble adopted at the previous meeting was illuminating; the latter was certainly not a step forward—quite the reverse. However, it was not yet too late for the Committee to redeem itself and make the Convention a really meaningful text of the kind which the majority of delegations sincerely wanted.

9. Mrs. DE CATTAROSS (Uruguay) said she had been unable to vote in favour of the Nigerian-USSR amendment because it introduced into the preamble provisions which had no reason to appear there and which weakened the draft Convention. However, since Uruguay had always condemned any manifestation of colonialism or racialism, her delegation had merely abstained. If the Italian sub-amendment, which her delegation had supported in a spirit of compromise, had been adopted, her delegation would still have abstained from voting on the Nigerian-USSR amendment, as amended, because it had been opposed to the addition

of a new preambular paragraph, for the technical and legal reasons it had stated at the 1502nd meeting.

10. In the vote on whether the Italian sub-amendment was in order, her delegation had cast an affirmative vote and was glad that very rightly the majority of delegations had done likewise.

11. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) said that she had voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment because the proposed addition to the third preambular paragraph would have the effect of minimizing the importance of the earlier part of the paragraph regarding infringements of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was precisely the objective of the Convention to prevent such infringements. However valid the concept expressed in the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment might be, it had no place in the preamble and her delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the third preambular paragraph as a whole.

12. She had voted against the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth preambular paragraph, which deleted any reference to the freedom to practise religion or manifest a belief. The distinction between freedom of conscience and freedom of action was absolutely vital. Her delegation had voted in favour of the fourth paragraph, as amended. Being in favour of a specific formulation, it had nonetheless not wished to oppose a general one.

13. The sixteen-Power amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1468/Rev.1/Corr.2) was open to some of the same objections as the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment. It was true that religion as well as militant atheism could be abused for political ends and that such abuses should be countered, although the word "combat" was not the most appropriate. However, since that clause might be invoked for political ends to limit the freedom of the individual, her delegation had abstained from voting on the amendment and on the fifth paragraph as a whole, as amended.

14. With regard to the amendment proposed by Nigeria and the Soviet Union, adding a new preambular paragraph, her delegation had objected to an earlier version of that proposal and its objections applied with even greater force to the new wording, inasmuch as the words "manifestations of religion or belief" had been replaced by the words "the right to freedom of religion or belief". The right of every individual to freedom of conscience was an absolute right which was quite distinct from his right to manifest his religion or belief subject only to the maintenance of public order. No other limitation could be imposed on freedom of conscience by the State or any outside authority for any reason whatever and, in any event, the State could not control thoughts; indeed, the right to freedom of conscience was one of the rights inherent in the status of a human being, an absolute right. It was not that freedom, but freedom of action, which needed protection, and that was the purpose of the Convention. The Nigerian-USSR amendment, which had been adopted, suggested that freedom of religion or belief could be wrongly used and that there was a real danger that it might be abused so as to impede the elimination of colonialism and racialism. She emphatically rejected the implication that insistence on freedom of conscience was incompatible with rejection of

racialism and colonialism. Indeed, her rejection of colonialism and racialism rested on the same basis of belief in the rights of the individual as her insistence on freedom of conscience. Her delegation's position on colonialism and racialism was well known and was exemplified by the fact that Ireland had supported and had voted for the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 1514 (XV). Ireland was the only country in western Europe which had had experience of imperialism and foreign rule over a period of centuries. Ireland had experienced both colonialism and religious discrimination and intolerance, and knew that they were two facets of the same wrong, both of which it strongly rejected. That was why her delegation could not accept the idea that a choice might have to be made between the right to freedom of conscience and the elimination of colonialism and racialism. The new paragraph did harm to both the causes which it purported to serve by setting one against the other and failing to recognize that they had a common basis.

15. Her delegation wanted the Convention to provide effective protection for human rights throughout the world, and it had therefore voted against the new preambular paragraph proposed by Nigeria and the USSR. It had voted in favour of the other amendments to the preamble and of the corresponding paragraphs, as amended.

16. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said that he had been ready to vote in favour of the preamble as submitted by the Commission on Human Rights, subject to some amendments which, without altering the tenor of the text, would have improved and strengthened it. His delegation had been obliged to vote against all the amendments which would incorporate in the text considerations or elements extraneous to the problem of religious intolerance. It felt that a convention aimed at protecting human rights should not impose, for political reasons, vague and tendentious limits on the exercise of those rights. The last preambular paragraphs were anti-religious in spirit, for they treated religious manifestations with mistrust and sought to limit them on the pretext that they could be abused for unworthy ends; yet at no point was there any mention of the abuse that was equally possible in the case of atheism or non-theistic beliefs, which could also be used to impede the elimination of colonialism or racialism or could serve as instruments of interference in the affairs of other countries or peoples. Nazi neo-paganism had used non-theistic, and even pseudo-scientific, beliefs and ideologies to support its claims of the superiority of the Aryan race, and even now atheism used anti-religious slogans—declaring, for example, that religion was the opium of the people—for the purpose of overthrowing the social and political order of nations where religion was a fundamental principle. For all those reasons, his delegation had voted against the amendments which would limit the exercise of the rights and freedoms that the Convention was intended to protect. Moreover, since the Committee had not yet adopted article I, which defined what was to be understood by "religion or belief", a vote in favour of the amendments condemning any abuse of freedom of religion could only be interpreted as favouring abusive

manifestations of non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, which were not explicitly mentioned in the preamble but which should nevertheless be open to the same condemnation as theistic beliefs.

17. In his view, the amendments which had been adopted might permit the abuse, for political ends, of anti-religious beliefs at the national and international levels, particularly if article I of the draft was not adopted in its present form.

18. El Salvador had always condemned colonialism and racialism, and also any interference in the domestic affairs of other States and any action which threatened independence, sovereignty, or the right of peoples to self-determination. Its negative vote on the amendments should not, therefore, be interpreted as an indication of any liking for colonialism or racialism, which it continued whole-heartedly to condemn.

19. Mr. QUADRI (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment because it had felt that it was out of place in the draft Convention. The aim of the Convention was to protect the right of the individual to freedom of religion and belief throughout the world, but it was for each State to draft its own legislation.

20. His delegation had voted against the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth paragraph, because it regarded as vital the right "to practice religion as well as to manifest a belief", without which the right to freedom of religion or belief would have no legal significance.

21. His delegation had voted against the sixteen-Power amendment to the fifth paragraph, the wording of which it could not accept.

22. It had voted for the retention of the seventh paragraph, and regretted that the Committee had not been unanimous on that point.

23. With regard to the addition of a new paragraph, it regretted that anti-colonialism should have been abused for the purpose of introducing a wording which could not be accepted by all countries.

24. Argentina had voted in favour of the Italian sub-amendment, which had undoubtedly been in order, and against the Nigerian-USSR amendment.

25. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) stated that her delegation had voted against the sixteen-Power amendments, the effect of which was to limit the scope of the original text, and said that in Madagascar freedom of conscience was guaranteed in law and in fact.

26. Her delegation had voted against the amendment of Nigeria and the USSR because it negated the general and universal character of the Convention and because, in addition, it was ambiguous, giving the impression that there was a link between religion and belief on the one hand and colonialism and racialism on the other; she failed to see how religion, which was of a personal nature, could be associated with colonialism or racialism, which were matters of State policy. In her country the Church had often been in the vanguard of emancipation, and it seemed to her that decolonization went hand in hand with freedom of conscience.

27. Mrs. SIPILA (Finland) said that her delegation had voted against the second amendment of the sixteen-Powers to the fourth paragraph because it considered that freedom of religion and belief would not be complete unless it was accompanied by freedom to practise and manifest such religion or belief. It had also voted against the sixteen-Power amendment to the fifth paragraph because its wording was vague and would leave it open to unforeseen interpretations.

28. Finland had voted against the Nigerian-USSR amendment proposing the addition of a new preambular paragraph, firstly, because the new paragraph would be out of place in the Convention, the purpose of which was to eliminate intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief, and, secondly, because the Committee had already decided to eliminate all "isms"; the position of Finland with regard to colonialism and racialism was so well known that she need not repeat it.

29. Her delegation had also voted against the Italian sub-amendment because article XI met the same purpose and it was not necessary to include a negative paragraph in the preamble.

30. Mrs. NORTEN (Denmark) said that her delegation had abstained on the Italian sub-amendment, and on the amendment submitted by Nigeria and the Soviet Union. It believed that members of the Committee should do their utmost to secure the adoption of a text unequivocally recognizing the right of the individual to freedom of religion and belief. It had therefore been unable to support proposals designed to limit that fundamental freedom, particularly as it considered such limitations to be superfluous in view of the provisions of other international instruments. On the other hand, recognizing the spirit of compromise displayed in the Italian sub-amendment, and in keeping with Denmark's traditional attitude towards colonialism, her delegation had not gone so far as to vote against the two proposals in question but had simply abstained.

31. Mr. DINSTEIN (Israel) said, in explanation of vote on the additional paragraph to the preamble, that his delegation was not opposed to the substance of the provision. Israel had consistently supported measures designed to eliminate the remnants of colonialism and to free mankind from the scourge of racialism. But his delegation felt that the addition to the preamble was procedurally wrong in the light of the Committee's decision to avoid all references to specific examples in the Convention. That decision of the Committee was perhaps regrettable; in fact Israel had voted against it. However, having once determined the issue, the Committee should have abided by its ruling. If one example of a particularly pernicious intolerance—namely, that of anti-Semitism—was excluded, other instances of discrimination—including the heinous example of racialism—had to be omitted.

32. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said that her delegation had voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment and the amendment submitted by Nigeria and the Soviet Union. Though it was opposed to colonialism and realized that religion had been used as an instrument of colonialism in the past, it regarded that question as a matter coming within the competence of other

United Nations bodies. It felt that the Third Committee should confine itself to matters directly related to religion and should not introduce considerations of a political nature.

33. Mrs. HARRIS (United States of America) said that her delegation had been prepared to vote for the original text of the preamble, which had been approved without any objection in the Commission on Human Rights. It had nevertheless decided to support the sixteen-Power proposals (A/C.3/L.1468/Rev.1) without insisting on the changes in wording which it would have liked. It did so in a spirit of co-operation and compromise, in the interest of facilitating the work of the Committee.

34. Her delegation had not, however, been able to support the amendments proposed by the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.1460/Rev.1), because they sought to introduce some unnecessary elements into the preamble and to deprive it of one of the most important paragraphs.

35. With regard to the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth paragraph, replacing the words "to practise religion as well as to manifest a belief" by the words "of religion or belief", the explanations given by the sponsors had convinced her that the amendment was merely a drafting improvement and that the words "religion or belief" preserved the full meaning of the words they were intended to replace.

36. She objected to the delaying tactics and the language used by one representative at the last meeting. Such tactics demonstrated conclusively that the Government concerned was trying to prevent the adoption of the draft Convention. One example of that attitude was the Soviet Union amendment regarding the addition of two new paragraphs to the preamble, which had been introduced for political motives and had nothing to do with the Convention itself. It was not true that freedom of religion or belief was prejudicial to the struggle against colonialism and racialism.

37. For similar reasons she had voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment, which could be interpreted as meaning that manifestations of religion or belief which were permissible under the Charter and the national laws of Member States constituted interference in the internal affairs of other States.

38. She regretted that the Committee's discussions had been marked by political polemics and not by the good faith and spirit of compromise which were required in drafting an international legal document.

39. Mr. MELOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had already explained its position in regard to some of the principles on which the Convention should be based and in that spirit had expressed its support of amendments which improved the text. Accordingly, it had voted for the sixteen-Power amendments, the sub-amendment of Saudi Arabia and the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union.

40. He had been unable to support the Italian sub-amendment, although he agreed with its substance, since its adoption would have excluded from the text the idea that a religion or belief should not impede the struggle against colonialism and racism. He re-

gretted that that proposal had not been submitted in the form of a separate paragraph, which most delegations, including his own, might then have been able to support.

41. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she wished to make it clear that her delegation's vote against the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union could not be construed as a vote in favour of colonialism. The reasons for her vote were, first, her delegation's belief that the reference to colonialism though an unexceptional statement of fact by itself, was out of place in a convention on the elimination of religious intolerance and discrimination. Secondly, the introduction of that passage unbalanced the preamble. Though religion could impede decolonization, it in fact nowadays often played a good and constructive role in that respect. In any event, no exhortation in a convention could possibly improve the excellent record of successive United Kingdom governments in that field; nor that of the British Labour Party. Thirdly, and finally, the purpose of the Convention was not only to eliminate religious discrimination, but also to positively enjoin tolerance upon Governments. Where special circumstances did not justify absolute tolerance, there were the safeguards in articles XI and XII. The insertion of restrictive clauses in the preamble, of the type introduced by Nigeria and the Soviet Union, could only weaken the Convention and encourage those who wished to oppress minorities. The United Kingdom delegation had voted for the Italian sub-amendment because of the alternatives offered it was to be preferred and because it merely echoed the wording of article XI.

42. The United Kingdom delegation had also voted for the retention of the original seventh paragraph. That was because the United Kingdom believed that religious intolerance was an evil which persisted today. That view was presumably shared by the great majority of delegations, all but nine of whom voted for the maintenance of the original paragraph. The United Kingdom believed that the essential purpose of the Convention was to protect believers and not to serve as a charter for non-believers.

43. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that her delegation wished to correct a mistake it had made at the 1503rd meeting in stating its position on the sixteen-Power amendments. It had not been able to support the second amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph because it had considered that the deletion of the reference to freedom to practise religion as well as to manifest a belief affected the substance of the paragraph and considerably weakened the scope of the draft Convention; it could not see what value the Convention would have if that situation was not recognized in the preamble itself. It had therefore voted against that amendment.

44. Secondly, her delegation had abstained on the Italian sub-amendment because it merely repeated ideas which were already included in other parts of the Convention, especially article XI.

45. Lastly, her delegation had abstained on the amendment of Nigeria and the USSR, since it had considered that Venezuela could never oppose texts which in the final analysis were designed to permit decolonization,

a responsibility of the United Nations. While it thought that such a reference was superfluous in the draft Convention, a vote by Venezuela against that proposal would have been, or could have been, regarded as inconsistent with its basic position on colonial matters. That attitude was in line with the attitude taken by her delegation in the Sixth Committee when it had unanimously adopted the declaration on territorial asylum, article 1 of which referred specifically, when speaking of those who might seek asylum, to persons struggling against colonialism.

46. Mrs. MERCHANT (Canada) said that she had voted against the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth preambular paragraph because, in her view, the right to practise a religion and manifest a belief was of fundamental importance, and without that right freedom of religion or belief was a meaningless concept. She had also voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment and the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union, which introduced elements extraneous to the real purposes of the Convention. She was sorry that she had had to vote against the Italian sub-amendment which, although it was a commendable attempt at a compromise and echoed the wording of article XI, was based on exactly the same principle as the two other amendments. The provisions of article XI might be acceptable in a safeguard clause, but the whole spirit of the Convention would be changed if they were inserted in the preamble. She feared that the amendments now incorporated in the preamble might allow the Convention to be used as a weapon against freedom of religion.

47. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that he had voted against the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union, as he thought that political questions such as colonialism or racism had no place in a convention on the elimination of religious intolerance and should be discussed by other United Nations bodies. Moreover, there did not seem to be any real need for the Convention to include a clause condemning colonialism, since present-day missionaries could hardly be suspected of colonialist tendencies. On the contrary, religion, and particularly the Catholic Church, had become an instrument in the campaign for the liberation of peoples and for social progress as was clear from various encyclicals issued by Popes Pius XII, John XXIII and Paul VI. Insinuations that his own country was supporting colonialism and racism would be entirely without foundation.

48. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) said that her delegation would be unable to express a view on the preamble as a whole so long as the expression "religion or belief" was not defined in article I. Her delegation could not accept the present definition, according to which the expression "religion or belief" included theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, for the Indonesian Constitution made faith in God the foundation of the State.

49. Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) recalled that, during the debate, his delegation had said that while it approved of the version of the draft Convention presented by the Commission on Human Rights, it was prepared to agree to improvements in the wording provided that the basic principles were not altered. It had accordingly voted for the new title, which had been

proposed by the sixteen Powers and was more in keeping with the purpose of the Convention; it had also voted for all the amendments which it had considered compatible with the purposes of the Convention. Where that had not been the case, it had had to vote against the proposed text or to abstain. It had, for example, voted against the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth paragraph, which weakened the scope of the basic text. It believed it was essential to guarantee the right of every individual to practise his religion and to manifest his beliefs; that right was proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and was consecrated, from the legal point of view, in article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. His delegation had also opposed the amendments which placed undue emphasis in infelicitous language on the abuses which might be committed in the name of religion. Thus, it had voted against the sub-amendment of Saudi Arabia and against the sixteen-Power amendment to the fifth paragraph. It had also voted against the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union. As it had, however, recognized the need for safeguards against abuses to be embodied in the preamble, it had presented a formal proposal for that purpose (A/C.3/L.1477). He commended the Chairman for the wisdom she had shown when in the debate on whether the Italian sub-amendment was in order, she had allowed the Committee to obtain the necessary clarification by requesting the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs. He also praised the spirit of fairness which the members had shown in the vote on the question of the admissibility of his sub-amendment, and he thanked the delegations which had voted for his proposal.

50. His delegation's position in the voting on the different parts of the preamble had been determined both by strictly legal considerations and by reasons having to do with justice and truth. The sub-amendment of Saudi Arabia, for example, condemned interference in the affairs of a State, which raised some difficulties. In international law the words "intervention in the affairs of a State" were used to mean unlawful interference by one State in the affairs of another State. However, the Convention was not concerned with such problems because it was intended to, and indeed should, guarantee the rights of individuals. The new paragraph submitted by Nigeria and the Soviet Union was contrary to the purpose and spirit of the Convention, particularly because it was unfair to imply that there was any kind of opposition between religion and decolonization.

51. Mr. LAVALLE (Guatemala) said that his delegation had voted against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment because it did not believe that the preamble should contain an unqualified condemnation of every kind of interference based on religion. Indeed, the measures for the implementation of the Convention provided for the establishment of a control system which would in effect legitimize a certain form of interference as a means of guaranteeing religious freedom. Furthermore, the sub-amendment destroyed the harmonious relationship between the preamble and the operative part. The Convention did not deal with relations between States but was intended to

guarantee the religious freedom of individuals in the State.

52. He had also voted against the second amendment of the sixteen Powers to the fourth paragraph because he considered that freedom of religion or belief was meaningless without freedom to practise one's religion and to manifest one's belief. He had also voted against the sixteen-Power amendment to the fifth paragraph, which seemed to him incompatible with the purpose of the Convention. He had voted against the new paragraph proposed by Nigeria and the Soviet Union, because he considered that colonialism and racialism bore no relation to the purpose of the Convention.

53. Mr. PAOLINI (France), recalling the position of his delegation as already explained in the course of the debate, said that in voting against the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment and the amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union, he had wished to express opposition to any proposal which would introduce purely political considerations into the preamble. The Committee had already decided to exclude any reference to anti-Semitism, some delegations considering such reference to be motivated by political considerations. On the other hand, he had voted for the Italian sub-amendment, which exhibited a laudable spirit of compromise and avoided the introduction of purely political considerations. He regretted that elements of political controversy had been introduced which weakened the text of the draft. They thus ran counter to the true purpose of the Convention, which was the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

54. Mrs. NIKOI (Ghana) said that while she approved of the principles set out in the original Soviet Union amendment and believed that the Convention should provide the necessary safeguards against possible abuses of religion, she considered that the problems of colonialism and racialism were within the purview of the Fourth Committee and should not be mentioned in the Convention. She had therefore abstained in the vote on the Nigerian and Soviet amendment. On the other hand, she had voted for the Italian sub-amendment, which offered the necessary safeguards without mentioning purely political questions.

55. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he rejected the charges directed against his delegation, particularly by the United States, which had accused it of being unwilling to co-operate and of introducing political elements into the debate. His delegation had, on the contrary, proved its desire to contribute to the success of the draft Convention and the adoption of a well-formulated text acceptable to all. The version of the preamble which had been adopted at the previous meeting seemed to him far superior to the version submitted by the Commission on Human Rights. It was clearer, more balanced and better worded. Also, it reflected the present situation and took account of the opinion of the majority of the members in the Committee. The new version had been drawn up with the active participation of the Afro-Asian countries, which were inadequately represented in the Commission on Human Rights and whose opinion had not been respected when the original text had been prepared. The amendment of Nigeria and the Soviet Union reflected the views on

the preamble that had been expressed in the debate, and it was based on the conclusions of the Seminar of Human Rights in Developing Countries. His delegation had consistently shown a spirit of co-operation, as in the case of the sub-amendments presented by Pakistan, Argentina and Nigeria. With regard to the political considerations which he had been accused of introducing into the Convention, all debates in the United Nations, on whatever subject, reflected such considerations because every question inevitably gave rise to a conflict of ideologies. Indeed, it was to

enable the various countries to express their different opinions that the United Nations had been established. If the United States made accusations against the Soviet Union, it would have to make them as well against all the countries which had proposed amendments to the preamble, including the countries which had taken part in the Seminar on Human Rights in Developing Countries and whose views were reflected in the new paragraph proposed by Nigeria and the Soviet Union.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.