

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING
held on Sunday, 5 May 1968, at 11 a.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. AGUILAR	Venezuela
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. PAHR	Austria

FORMULATION AND PREPARATION OF A HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAMME TO BE UNDERTAKEN SUBSEQUENT TO THE CELEBRATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNIVERSAL RESPECT FOR, AND OBSERVANCE OF, HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS FOR ALL WITHOUT DISTINCTION AS TO RACE, COLOUR, SEX, LANGUAGE OR RELIGION, IN PARTICULAR (agenda item 11) (A/CONF.32/L.14 and Corr.1; A/CONF.32/C.2/L.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.2/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.3-L.6, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.7/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.8-L.10, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.12-L.14, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.15/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.16 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.17-L.23, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.24 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.25/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.26-L.35)

- (d) MEASURES TO PROMOTE WOMEN'S RIGHTS IN THE MODERN WORLD, INCLUDING A UNIFIED LONG-TERM UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMME FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued);
- (e) MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN THE DEFENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF INDIVIDUALS (continued);
- (f) INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (continued);
- (g) OTHER MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN PROMOTING THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF POLITICAL, CIVIL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE IMPROVEMENT OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES AND SUCH INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AS MAY BE REQUIRED (continued)

Mr. FERRARI BRAVO (Italy) introduced draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.20 concerning illiterate persons.

Illiteracy was one of the most serious obstacles to economic, social and cultural development. Owing to the importance of the written word in the modern world, illiterate persons were incapable of enjoying their rights. They might, for instance, be totally deprived of the right to education. They only enjoyed their right to work to a very small degree, for they were compelled to accept occupations rejected by others and they were bound to be exploited by those who could read and write.

States and international organizations had made great efforts to combat illiteracy. The task facing developing countries was enormous. As a result of various efforts, including the formation of a corps of instructors, Iran, the host country to the Conference, had been very successful. In Italy itself, total literacy had not yet been achieved. The authorities were making efforts to eliminate pockets of illiteracy which remained, particularly in the remote mountain regions.

The problem had been tackled internationally, for instance at the 1965 Teheran Congress of Ministers of Education. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had set up an International Consultative Liaison Committee for Literacy, under the Chairmanship of Princess Ashraf Pahlavi. The

situation was still serious, however, and although there had been a percentage decrease in the number of illiterate persons in the world population, the total was increasing in absolute terms. According to UNESCO's figures, it would rise from 740 million in 1960 to 810 million in 1970. It was more serious than the problem of educating the young, in that adults who had learned to read and write were liable to become illiterate again later because of the conditions under which they lived. The Italian delegation had therefore taken the initiative in submitting draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.20. The draft was based on article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which recognized the right to education, and other instruments such as the 1966 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Operative paragraph (a) took account of the potential effort of the full utilization of intellectual and material resources on economic development. Operative paragraph (b) was addressed primarily to developed countries, capable of giving assistance because illiteracy was not one of their major problems. Operative paragraph (c) took account of the relationship between the elimination of illiteracy and the effective enjoyment of human rights. Operative paragraph (d) dealt with the technical assistance that might be provided by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, especially UNESCO, in finding a final solution to the problem of illiterate persons.

Mr. ARDALAN (Iran), speaking in support of the statement by the representative of Italy, said that the link between the effective and general enjoyment of human rights and the campaign against illiteracy was undeniable, as had long been recognized by the United Nations. That was why the Universal Declaration of Human Rights expressly proclaimed that "Everyone has the right to education" and that "Education shall be free at least in the elementary and fundamental stages".

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provided that "fundamental education shall be encouraged or intensified as far as possible for those persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education".

The UNESCO Convention and Recommendation against Discrimination in Education further extended the obligations as regards educational opportunities for that group of persons.

In 1961, in consequence of the decisions by the United Nations General Assembly and the General Conference of UNESCO, new prospects had opened up for the elimination of illiteracy. Under the leadership of H.I.M. The Shahinshah, the Government of Iran had been a pioneer in that field.

In 1965, the Teheran Congress had unanimously recognized the need to provide for experimental literacy programmes in economic development plans.

Another result of that Congress had been to raise the problem of literacy to the world level. It was a universal evil and called for world-wide measures. It was the beginning of a more general course of action for eliminating an evil that directly or indirectly affected the whole world. The International Consultative Liaison Committee for Literacy had recommended that "during Human Rights Year (1968) and, in particular at the International Conference on Human Rights at Teheran, special attention should be given to the connexion between adult literacy and the protection and promotion of human rights".

Efforts between 1950 and 1960 in the field of adult education had led to a decrease in the percentage of illiterate persons in the world, but not enough progress had been made. To remedy the situation, efforts would have to be redoubled.

The financial and technical resources available had never been as great or as effective. They enabled mankind to work for literacy with maximum success. Renewed efforts were called for in the developing countries and a more generous participation by developed countries in international and bilateral aid programmes.

The International Consultative Liaison Committee for Literacy had invited member States to follow the example of those States which had already made an ex gratia contribution to UNESCO's Special Fund for Literacy and to appeal to public opinion in their countries with a view to stimulating and encouraging efforts to increase such contributions.

It was to be hoped that draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.20 would be adopted unanimously. By so doing, the Teheran Conference would be underlining the importance of prompt and concerted world action.

Mr. SAARIO (Finland) pointed out that the right to privacy, which was the subject of draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.22, was enshrined in article 12 of the Universal Declaration. It was also implicit in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, without, however, being set forth more explicitly.

Those who took an interest in human rights were becoming increasingly aware of the importance of that right in connexion with a great variety of problems. For example, the supersonic aeroplanes which flew over inhabited areas at low altitude, the hidden cameras used to watch employees in enterprises and the Press which published biographical details of juvenile delinquents, all constituted interference

in private life and attacks on the dignity and integrity of the human person. Scientific and technological advances were making such intrusions more and more easy.

Finland thought that the problem deserved to be included in any programme of studies which the United Nations might undertake concerning the aspects of human rights which had not yet received adequate attention. Current practices in the field of journalism, in particular, were related to that problem. That was why there was a special operative paragraph in the draft resolution concerning model professional codes of journalism.

Mrs. SAAB (Lebanon), speaking on behalf also of Mexico and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.23 dealing with publicity for the Universal Declaration in all the States Members of the United Nations.

The text was in keeping with the resolution in which the General Assembly, at the time of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration, had requested that the Declaration should be translated into all languages and widely disseminated in all the States Members of the United Nations.

The draft resolution would provide a basis for continuing United Nations action in the field of human rights. The Lebanese delegation hoped that it would quickly be voted upon and unanimously adopted.

Mr. POPESCU (Romania) pointed out that draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.23 was relevant to all the problems being considered by the Committee, from the education of youth to the general programme relating to the status of women.

Speaking on behalf of the French delegation and UNESCO, as well as Romania, he said that he saw no reason why the draft resolution should not be incorporated into draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5 as an amendment. It might, however, be preferable to incorporate it into the draft resolution on the status of women.

Mr. SHAHABUDDIN (India), speaking on behalf also of the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and India, introduced draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.30 on the relationship between economic development and human rights.

During the general discussion, many representatives had drawn attention to the close relationship between economic and social development and the prospects for human rights. In that connexion, he drew the Conference's attention to the study in document A/CONF.32/L.2, whose author, Mr. Figueres, had noted that economic and social development was an indispensable means to the full realization of human rights

in the modern world, and that the economic backwardness of the people of the developing countries was one of the main factors preventing them from taking full advantage of their fundamental rights.

It rested with each State to develop its own economy, thereby ensuring its people the full enjoyment of fundamental freedoms. In the developing countries, however, success was largely dependent on the assistance received from the developed countries. He regretted that the external aid target assigned to the developed countries for the United Nations Development Decade had not been achieved and that the gap between the developing countries and the developed countries was widening. In addition to the difficulties resulting from that situation, the burden of foreign debt was becoming so heavy that the developing countries would soon be threatened with complete economic stagnation.

Referring to the economic difficulties facing the developing countries owing to the international trade situation - difficulties which the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at New Delhi in February and March 1968, had studied in detail - he asked the Conference to take note of the close relationship between the question of human rights and the problems of international assistance and international trade. For people who were forced to live without dignity or hope, human rights and fundamental freedoms were virtually meaningless, despite declarations, conventions and other international instruments, however well drafted. That was a problem whose importance had been emphasized at the beginning of the Conference by both H.I.M. The Shahinshah of Iran and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In that context, the Conference's attention should once again be drawn to the Montreal Statement of the Assembly for Human Rights.

The Indian delegation hoped that draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.30 would be unanimously adopted.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland) announced that his delegation, together with the Ukrainian delegation, had submitted a draft resolution concerning responsibility for war crimes (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.39).

The preamble to the draft resolution reviewed the activity of the United Nations in that field. The sufferings which mankind had endured during the Second World War, the mass extermination of civilian populations and the horror of concentration camps had cruelly brought home the necessity of preventing a recurrence of such atrocities and of clarifying the question of responsibility for war crimes and crimes against peace and humanity.

That realization had resulted in a number of measures: in 1945-46 the General Assembly had approved the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal; in 1948 it had drafted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; in 1951 it had established the International Law Commission, which had worked on a draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind.

More recently, the Commission on Human Rights had discussed various problems: the inapplicability of statutory limitation to war crimes, extradition of war criminals, exchange of information and indemnification of civilian victims. The French representative, Mr. Cassin, had said that that work represented a new and important milestone in the protection of mankind.

The sponsors of the draft resolution were asking that in the coming years that question, which had not yet been studied systematically, should be considered one of great urgency; what was at stake was no less than the protection of mankind.

Mr. BITKER (United States of America) introduced an amendment submitted by his delegation (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.21) to draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.3 concerning legal aid.

The United States was in favour of the draft resolution, because the correct functioning of justice implied competent legal assistance. The United States Supreme Court had recently taken a number of decisions based on that principle.

The United States amendment drew the attention of States to the technical assistance obtainable from the United Nations; the human rights advisory services programme established by the General Assembly over ten years earlier provided for seminars, fellowships and services of experts. The aim of the United States amendment was to remind member States of that form of assistance, to which they had recourse all too infrequently.

Mrs. SIPIILÄ (Finland), introducing draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.25 on the defence of women's rights in the modern world, said that it was a synthesis of four earlier draft resolutions: A/CONF.32/C.2/L.12, L.6, L.9 and L.10. The draft resolution submitted jointly by the twenty-two delegations which had sponsored the four original texts, had collected yet another signature, that of Sweden, whose representative, a former Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women, had assisted in the final drafting. The draft resolution also embodied the substance of draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.8, submitted by Uruguay.

The draft resolution related to agenda item 11(d), which could be sub-divided into two headings: measures to promote women's rights in the modern world, and formulation of a unified long-term programme for the advancement of women.

After reading out and commenting on the text, the preamble of which reproduced almost word for word the preamble and article 1 of the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, she stressed the necessity and value of rapid improvement in women's status; the slow development of that status, owing to the persistence of wrong ideas, was paralysing the whole process of development. That was not a mere assumption: studies conducted in several countries had shown that progress would have been faster if women had played a greater part. It should be remembered that women made up half the population of the world. The Conference, which proclaimed that the full exercise of fundamental rights implied respect for economic and cultural rights, and which deplored the gap separating the rich nations from the poor and ignorant ones, could not allow such a potential of human resources to remain unexploited.

It had been said by some that the Conference was wasting its time in dealing with women's rights; there again, the problem was a universal one, unlike apartheid, slavery and racial discrimination. Women too were weary of constantly having to claim full equality of rights with men. They were eager to pass on to other questions; surely, the best way of achieving that was to implement the good resolutions which had so often been endorsed but never put into effect.

Mr. PAHR (Austria), Rapporteur, stated that he had examined the various draft resolutions placed before the Committee and had tried to classify them so that the Committee could complete its work in the time remaining to it. In his view, there were two kinds of draft resolution: those dealing with specific questions which could not possibly be combined with others, and those of a more general character, whose sponsors might be invited to agree to amalgamate several texts, as had been done in the case of agenda item 11 (d), where several texts had been merged into one and others had been withdrawn.

The following draft resolutions belonged to the first category:

A/CONF.32/C.2/L.2 (family planning), to which two amendments had already been accepted by the sponsors. The final text, however, had yet to be circulated; A/CONF.32/C.2/L.3 and L.21 (Legal aid), on which the delegations concerned had already been consulted;

A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11 and another draft resolution, also relating to economic, social and cultural rights, on which agreement could easily be reached;

A/CONF.32/C.2/L.16 (human rights in the light of scientific and technical progress);

A/CONF.32/C.2/L.22 (human rights and the improper use of information media);
A/CONF.32/C.2/L.20 (illiteracy);

A/CONF.32/C.2/L.1 (model rules of procedure to facilitate inquiries into violations of human rights);

Lastly, four draft resolutions still in preparation, announced by Israel (minorities), the United Kingdom (detention, and freedom of thought) and Poland (war crimes and crimes against humanity).

The following came within the second category:

The Haitian draft resolution on the preparation of programmes in the field of human rights (A/CONF.32/L.14 and Corr.1) which was of such vast scope that it could embrace all the others; a draft resolution (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.28) by the Nigerian delegation, which could incorporate draft resolutions A/CONF.32/C.2/L.4, L.14, L.16, L.18, L.23 and L.24, although no decision had yet been taken on combining them; and lastly, a draft resolution on the education of youth (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5), an amendment to which had been incorporated in the revised draft. The French, Lebanese and Romanian delegations had already been consulted about an amalgamation of those texts.

The CHAIRMAN congratulated the Rapporteur on his excellent report to the Committee. As there were no comments, he assumed that in principle the Committee endorsed the suggestion made by the Rapporteur; he therefore asked delegations to hold discussions on the lines indicated.

Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) asked whether draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.22, submitted by Finland, and draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.16 and Corr.1, submitted by France and Switzerland, could not be combined into a single text.

Mrs. RÖSSEL (Sweden) said that a number of countries intended to submit a joint draft resolution on the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) at the afternoon meeting.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Rapporteur had made an excellent classification of the draft resolutions by subject, but it was difficult to see how the Committee should proceed in view of the short time at its disposal. It would seem to him advisable that non-controversial draft resolutions should be considered first, for otherwise the Committee might waste further precious time. He urged delegations to endeavour to reach agreement in order to reduce the number of texts submitted. His delegation feared that the numerous draft resolutions would give rise to many amendments and sub-amendments. He hoped that the Rapporteur would propose some means of overcoming the difficulty.

Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that, like the USSR representative, she feared that there would be lengthy discussions, on the Haitian draft resolution, for example. She suggested that the draft resolutions should be considered in the following order: A/CONF.32/C.2/L.20, L.12, L.13, L.5, L.27, L.16 and L.22.

Mr. GOUSSE (Haiti) said that he did not think that a draft resolution relating to a specific point need necessarily be controversial.

Mr. POPESCU (Romania) and Mrs. TELLAWI (United Arab Republic) agreed that the simplest draft resolutions should be considered first.

After a discussion in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America), Miss HENRION (Belgium), Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), Mr. POPESCU (Romania), Mrs. DEMBINSKA (Poland) and Mr. BONI (Ivory Coast) took part, Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) proposed that the Committee should ask the Chairman to organize the work for the afternoon meeting in consultation with the Rapporteur and the Vice-Chairman.

It was so decided.

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, stressed that there was too much political controversy in the debates of the Conference. In its desire to avoid such controversy, his delegation had refrained from replying to specific attacks made against its country. The USSR representative had been mistaken in thinking that the statements made in the Second Committee the previous day by Mr. Grogan, a member of the United States delegation, had specifically mentioned the USSR. He urged the Conference not to waste any more valuable time in controversies of that nature.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.