



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/C.2/SR.217
4 May 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-second Session

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 31 March 1967, at 3.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

Applications and reapplications for consultative status (E/C.2/R.33 and
Add.1 and 2) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. FORSHELL	Sweden
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BELEOKEN	Cameroon
	Mr. HANDL	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. PAOLINI	France
	Mr. CONSALVES	India
	Mr. TABITI	Morocco
	Mr. VARELA	Panama
	Mr. UY	Philippines
	Mr. NASINOVSKY	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. MOON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY	United Republic of Tanzania
	Mrs. PAULOS	United States of America
	Mr. NAVA CARRILLO	Venezuela
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. HOGAN	Secretary of the Committee

APPLICATIONS AND REAPPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS (E/C.2/R.33 and Add.1 and 2)
(continued)

Reapplications of international organizations for consultative status in
Category B International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Dean, representative of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, took a place at the Committee table.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) said that IADL was the largest organization of its kind in the world, with affiliated associations in forty-four countries and individual members in most others. Representatives from sixty-six countries had attended its last Congress, held at Budapest in 1964, and representatives from 115 nations had attended the World Peace through Law Conference held in Athens in 1966.

If it was granted consultative status, IADL would be able to make a great contribution to the work of the United Nations, especially during the International Year for Human Rights, since its members throughout the world were deeply concerned with such questions as the elimination of racial discrimination, equal rights for women, the protection of trade union and political rights and the independence and sovereignty of nations. In his opinion, IADL fulfilled the requirements laid down by the United Nations for the granting of consultative status.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) asked why there were so few associations affiliated with IADL in the Latin American countries and how IADL was financed.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) replied that IADL welcomed association with Latin American lawyers and had affiliated associations in nine Latin American countries. It had always encouraged national independence and opposed neo-colonialism and it had affiliated associations only in countries where there was a sufficient number of lawyers imbued with those ideas. He agreed, however, that IADL could perhaps do more to inform lawyers in Latin America of its objectives.

On the question of finance, IADL received subscriptions from associations of lawyers in various countries and from individual members. The national affiliated associations had their own budgets and the source of their funds was not known to him.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that he was not satisfied with the answers given. He asked what conclusions had been reached at the international meeting on the adjustment of the United Nations to the present-day world, held at Nice in May 1965 with the support, *inter alia*, of IADL, and what conclusions had been reached concerning the statute of limitations for crimes against humanity by the group of lawyers from France and the Federal Republic of Germany who had met in February 1965.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) replied that IADL had consistently supported the basic principles of the United Nations and the Nice Conference had naturally sought to promote them. On the second question, the group of lawyers had opposed the statute and favoured extending the period in which prosecutions could be brought.

Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) asked whether IADL had an affiliated association or individual members in Cameroon, and, if the latter, whether they were Cameroonian and what were their names.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) replied that he understood that there were only individual members in Cameroon and that he felt sure that the organization would willingly supply their names. He added, however, that IADL would not supply the names of members in certain countries to representatives of the Governments of those countries.

Mr. UY (Philippines) observed that at the Committee's 210th meeting, when IADL's earlier application had been discussed, charges had been made that it had consistently attacked the United Nations and its specialized agencies since 1950, and those charges had not been denied. On that occasion, his delegation had said that such attacks were inconsistent with the enjoyment of consultative status. As he had said at the Committee's 215th meeting, however, his delegation was in favour of a more balanced representation of various points of view within the United Nations, and he asked whether IADL would now assure the Committee that it pledged itself to co-operate with the United Nations in defending the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, without any qualification.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) said that, provided constructive criticism was considered to be part of co-operation, IADL would welcome the opportunity to co-operate with the United Nations. The United Nations was a legal organ and there was sometimes disagreement in interpreting its Charter. As a body of lawyers, IADL would have opinions about the meaning of the Charter and would on occasions make recommendations concerning United Nations policy. IADL did not concede that it had attacked the United Nations, since it did not consider criticism of United Nations policy or actions to be attacks upon the United Nations as an institution.

Mr. MOON (United Kingdom) asked whether the financial accounts of IADL were published.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers), replied that they were published.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) pointed out that the International Commission of Jurists, a pro-Western organization, received money from a foundation to which the Central Intelligence Agency had admitted giving funds. He asked whether, as far as its representative knew, IADL had received any money from the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) replied that, as far as he knew, it had not.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) asked whether it was correct to assume that IADL had no intention of attacking the United Nations as such, but that if it considered that United Nations action so required, it would offer constructive criticism.

Mr. DEAN (International Association of Democratic Lawyers) said that if IADL's object had been to attack the United Nations it would not have asked for consultative status. It wished only to render service. He did not know of any attacks by IADL on the United Nations, nor did he know of any activity by IADL which should debar it from consultative status.

Mrs. PAULOS (United States of America) pointed out that Economic and Social Council resolution 288 B (X) demanded more of an organization given consultative status than that it should not attack the United Nations. As paragraph 4 of the resolution stated, the organization should undertake to support the work of the United Nations.

Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) said that, although IADL claimed to support the aims of the United Nations Charter, his Government considered that it had in the past intervened in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, Cameroon, in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter. Any organization which acted in such a way ought not to enjoy consultative status. Until IADL provided proof that it had changed its attitude, his delegation could not support its application.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) stated that his delegation would support IADL's application since it was convinced that an organization whose members included many eminent lawyers should be in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and that it could do no harm to allow it to enjoy at least the same status as the Soroptimist International Association, which had members in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and whose application had been supported at the previous meeting. He was not persuaded either that IADL had a history of attacking the United Nations or that it had interfered in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. Allegations had been made that IADL had attacked United Nations policy in 1950. At that time, however, there had been very few African and Asian States among the Members and it was unfair to make such a charge when the policy involved, namely, that concerning the Korean question, had been decided by a much smaller membership than the present. The Korean question had raised a number of difficulties which were not very dissimilar from some of those raised by United Nations action in the Congo in 1960, which was still criticized by many African States. The majority of Africa and Asian States attacked the past and present attitudes of a number of other Member States on the questions of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa. It was understandable that a group of lawyers without any commitment to politics should have opinions on such important international questions. It was clear from the information provided in document E/C.2/R.33/Add.2 and from the statement by the representative of IADL that the main purpose of that organization was to promote the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The general purposes of IADL reflected the language of the Charter itself, since they were: to promote the maintenance of peace and international co-operation, to restore, defend and develop democratic rights and liberties, and to promote the independence of all peoples.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey, Tanzania)

There could be no valid argument against admitting IADL to Category B consultative status. If, however, it was decided, for political reasons, not to grant IADL's application, his delegation would, during the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council, submit a resolution calling for the suspension of relations between the Council and all non-governmental organizations and the establishment of new criteria for the admission of such organizations to consultative status. The United Nations was a body based on the principle of universality and all political views should be given expression in it.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) said that the information in document E/C.2/R.33/Add.2 and the statements by the IADL representative showed clearly that IADL conformed to the criteria laid down in Council resolution 288 B (X). It had many distinguished members throughout the world and was well known for its devotion to the cause of peace, social progress and international understanding. It had been admitted to a mutual information relationship with UNESCO and was already co-operating closely with the United Nations in various spheres of activity. It would therefore make a useful contribution to the Council's work and he supported its application for Category B consultative status. The efforts to prevent its readmission to that status were politically motivated and flagrantly violated the principle of objectivity. The Committee tended to recommend the admission to consultative status of relatively unknown organizations with only a marginal interest in the Council's work, whose aims did not coincide with those of the United Nations.

Among the organizations already enjoying consultative status there were some, for instance, the so-called League for the Rights of Man, headed by the Czechoslovak renegade Papánek, which were misusing their consultative status for slanderous and tendentious attacks against socialist States and others which, as was disclosed recently, were used and financed by the CIA in order to pursue espionage and fulfil other clandestine activities in the interests of the foreign policy of the United States.

On the other hand, representative and objective international democratic organizations such as the IADL had been prevented for many years from entering into consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

In his view, a matter of principle was at stake and a radical change was called for.

/...

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he himself was a member of IADL and knew from experience that its funds were derived from members' dues and not from clandestine sources such as the Central Intelligence Agency. IADL's aims coincided with those of the United Nations; far from seeking to intervene in the domestic affairs of States, it actively defended the principles of non-intervention and national independence, especially in the case of the new States. It was objective and widely representative, for its members were drawn from all parts of the world and from countries with different political and economic systems. It would thus be in a better position to aid the Council than some non-governmental organizations already enjoying consultative status - such as the International Commission of Jurists - which were geographically limited in scope and politically biased in favour of the western countries. It was of the utmost importance that the Council should be able to consult organizations in which all points of view were represented, particularly in legal matters. He therefore supported IADL's application for readmission to Category B consultative status.

Mrs. PAULOS (United States of America) remarked that discussion of non-governmental organizations already enjoying consultative status was not on the agenda of the Committee. None of the non-governmental organizations enjoying consultative status had ever slavishly followed the foreign policy of the United States, or for that matter any country in Western Europe, Africa, Asia or Latin America. That independence from Governments was one of the most important contributions the non-governmental organizations had made to the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the Swedish representative, agreed with the Tanzanian representative that a review of the criteria laid down in resolution 288 B (X) might be desirable; but the Committee must be guided by those criteria for the time being.

Mr. TABITI (Morocco) felt that IADL's general purposes indicated that it would make a useful contribution to the work of the United Nations.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) expressed serious doubts as to the advisability of recommending the readmission of IADL to consultative status. It was significant that many democratic Latin American countries, including Panama, were not represented in that organization. Moreover, IADL had members in a number of countries where

/...

(Mr. Varela, Panama)

democratic principles were notoriously flouted, and in countries which were not Members of the United Nations. He therefore felt that IADL would not co-operate loyally with the United Nations and would vote against recommending its readmission to consultative status.

Mr. UY (Philippines), referring to the statement by the Tanzanian representative, explained that he had not accused IADL of attacking the United Nations, but had merely quoted from the records of the Committee's previous session. In view of the IADL representative's assurance that his organization would co-operate fully with the United Nations, he would support its application.

The Committee decided by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the application of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers for consultative status in Category B should be rejected.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) requested that the Committee's report should state that his delegation would raise the question of IADL's readmission to Category B consultative status at the next session of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the remarks of the Tanzania representative. In future, he would adopt the criterion applied by the Panamanian representative and would vote against the admission to consultative status of any non-governmental organization whose members included organizations or individuals from a country which was not a Member of the United Nations.

Mr. Dean withdrew.

New applications for consultative status

Category B

International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions

The Committee decided by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the application of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions for consultative status in Category B should be granted.

International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants (CIDADEC)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mrs. Gérin, representative of the International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants, took a place at the Committee table.

Mrs. GERIN (International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants) said that her organization's general purposes (E/C.2/R.33/Add.1, p. 2) conformed to the criteria laid down in Council resolution 288 B (X). Its membership was at present somewhat restricted geographically, owing to the highly specialized nature of the professional activities with which it was concerned and to its rule that national associations must have at least fifty individual members in order to qualify for admission. However, it hoped to expand its membership, especially in the developing countries; it already had corresponding members in Ethiopia and India and was in contact with potential members in Gabon, Guinea, Mauritania and the Sudan.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that according to document E/C.2/R.33/Add.1, p. 3, CIDADEC had members in "Germany". But there was no such country: there were two German States, the German Democratic Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany. He inquired what spheres of activity were covered by the experts who were members of CIDADEC.

Mrs. GERIN (International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants) said that the reference to "Germany" was a mistake: the text should read "Federal Republic of Germany". CIDADEC members provided expert opinions on all matters of interest to the courts: medicine, real estate, etc.

Mr. MOON (United Kingdom), referring to the USSR representative's statement, said that in his Government's view there was only one German State, the Federal Republic of Germany, and its Government was the only one which could claim to represent the German people.

Mrs. PAULOS (United States of America) and Mr. PAOLINI (France) associated themselves with those remarks.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) said that his Government considered that there were two German States, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany; the Government of the latter had no right to speak for the German people as a whole.

/...

Mr. MOON (United Kingdom) asked the CIDADEC representative whether Category B consultative status was really essential to the organization and whether its needs could not be met by inclusion in the Register.

Mrs. GERIN (International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants) replied that her organization had applied for Category B consultative status because it believed that its activities, particularly its work on the preparation of a code of professional ethics for judicial experts, would enable it to collaborate usefully with the Council. Moreover, it wished to expand its contacts in developing countries, which often inquired whether it was in consultative status with the United Nations.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that the information before the Committee did not seem to justify granting CIDADEC consultative status, but he would vote for its inclusion in the Register. It was notorious that when experts were called in to arbitrate a dispute involving goods exported to a developed country by a developing country, they usually favoured the former.

Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) asked whether CIDADEC intended to expand its activities in Africa.

Mrs. GERIN (International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants) replied that it did. It was in touch with a number of potential members in various African States and hoped to pursue its expansion in that continent.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the Swedish representative, agreed with those speakers who had suggested that for the time being it might suffice to include CIDADEC in the Register.

Mrs. GERIN (International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants) stated that CIDADEC would accordingly abandon its application for admission to Category B consultative status and apply for inclusion in the Register.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) thought that CIDADEC would not be able to make a useful contribution to the Council's work; its aims seemed to be mainly commercial, and its membership and sphere of activity were too restricted.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) said that CIDADEC's purposes and membership did not seem to substantiate admission to Category B consultative status, and he even had doubts as to the advisability of including it in the Register.

Mr. TABITI (Morocco) supported the inclusion of the organization in the Register; although important, its work was somewhat limited in scope.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) also supported such inclusion, because of the usefulness of the organization's work on the elaboration of a code of ethics for judicial experts. Inclusion in the Register would enable the organization to achieve the geographical expansion which it sought.

The Committee decided by 9 votes to 3, with 1 abstention, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the International Confederation of Associations of Experts and Consultants should be placed on the Register of the Secretary-General.

Mr. VOLODARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had voted against the inclusion of the organization in the Register, because its membership was very restrictive and its aims were far removed from those of the United Nations.

Mrs. Gérin withdrew.

World Peace through Law Center

At the Chairman's invitation, Miss Rooney, representative of the World Peace through Law Center, took a place at the Committee table.

Miss ROONEY (World Peace through Law Center) said that the creation of the Center had been an innovation in the legal profession. In the modern world of rapid communications, there was a vital need for an organized exchange of information among lawyers. As the Center expanded its activities, it found it essential to keep abreast of the work of the organs which reported to the Economic and Social Council, and also of the specialized agencies and of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The Center had worked to promote the acceptance of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes, prepared by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Center was also concerned with peace-keeping. If it were granted consultative status, it would learn from the activities of the Council and it hoped later to make a positive contribution to the Council's work.

(Miss Rooney, World Peace
through Law Center)

The Center had organized regional conferences in several continents; its President and Vice-Presidents came from the United States, Latin America, Africa and Asia. The last World Assembly had been attended by members from 126 nations.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, as stated in document E/C.2/R.33/Corr.1, the Center had members from Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. He wondered what were its views on the subject of apartheid.

The Center was not endorsed by USSR jurists, because its aim was to promote the acceptance of Western law throughout the world. It supported the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice - whose attitude in the question of South West Africa was well known - and wanted the Court to continue its interference in the internal affairs of States.

He asked whether the Center, many of whose officers were United States citizens, received any funds from the Central Intelligence Agency or from the American Fund for Free Jurists, which was itself subsidized by the CIA.

Miss ROONEY (World Peace through Law Center) stressed that the Center had no political affiliations. The American Bar Association had initially sponsored the Center, but exercised no control over it. The Center had its own charter and its own financing arrangements. Many United States lawyers were members of the Center, because they wanted to keep abreast of international developments and because the Center had been widely publicized in the United States. The only external financing she knew of was a grant of about \$4 million from the Ford Foundation to assist in meeting the costs of travel to conferences of the Center held at Athens and Washington. Large United States law firms had been asked to contribute to the costs of a conference to be held shortly at Geneva. Otherwise, the Center's funds came from individual registration fees, which were higher for United States members.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) remarked that the Center did not seem to meet the requirements laid down in paragraph 5 of Council resolution 288 B (X), since only individuals and not organizations could be admitted to membership in it. In addition, paragraph 8 of that resolution stated that members should exercise voting rights in relation to the policies or action of the international organization. The Center's policy-making World Assembly, however, consisted of one member from each nation elected as national chairman by the members of the Center of each nation.

/...

Miss ROONEY (World Peace through Law Center) replied that members of the legal profession all over the world were eligible for membership in the Center and could attend the World Assembly. Members from the same country elected one of their number to be their spokesman at the Assembly; the person elected acted in an individual capacity and not as a representative of his Government.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Center would be satisfied with inclusion in the Register.

Miss ROONEY (World Peace through Law Center) replied that the Center sought the closer association with the Council which would be conferred by consultative status in Category B.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) supported the granting of Category B status to the Center.

The Committee decided by 5 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the application of the World Peace through Law Center for Category B consultative status should be granted.

Miss Rooney withdrew.

International Christian Union of Business Executives

The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the application of the International Christian Union of Business Executives should be deferred for one year.

It was so decided.

Mutual Assistance of the Latin American Government Oil Companies

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the organization seemed to be governmental rather than non-governmental.

Mr. NAVA-CARRILLO (Venezuela) replied that the organization was not governmental. It met the requirements stipulated in paragraph 8 of Council resolution 288 B (X), since it had not been established by inter-governmental agreement. The Latin American oil companies were State enterprises which had initially received government support, but which were now quite independent.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that acceptance of applications by commercial companies would unduly swell the ranks of the non-governmental organizations in consultative status and set a bad precedent.

Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) said that his delegation favoured the application, because it supported the efforts of regional organizations uniting a number of developing countries. The Economic and Social Council should have the benefit of the collaboration of such organizations.

Mr. UY (Philippines) agreed that the organization in question could make a useful contribution to the Council's activities in the cause of economic development. Council resolution 288 B (X) made no distinction between commercial and non-commercial non-governmental organizations.

Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that, in the case under consideration, national organizations had joined together to present their views through an international non-governmental organization. That was in accordance with paragraph 9 of Council resolution 288 B (X). The organization was working to achieve the economic integration of Latin America and to protect the exports of the developing countries. It was therefore pursuing the same objectives as the Economic and Social Council.

The Committee decided by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the application of the Mutual Assistance of the Latin American Government Oil Companies for Category B consultative status should be granted.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.