

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

held on Tuesday, 23 April 1968, at 11.30 a.m.

President:

H.I.H. Princess Ashraf PAHLAVI

Iran

## SPECIAL MESSAGES ADDRESSED TO THE CONFERENCE

Mr. SCHREIBER (Executive Secretary of the Conference) read out messages received by the Secretariat since the opening of the Conference from Marshal Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Lübke, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Mr. Boye, Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-fourth session.<sup>4/</sup>

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to consider items 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the provisional agenda. The draft rules of procedure (A/CONF.32/2) had been drawn up by the Preparatory Committee for the Conference established in pursuance of General Assembly Resolution 2081 (XX) of 20 December 1965 and had been considered by the General Assembly and modified by resolution 2339 (XXII) of 18 December 1967. With regard to the election of other officers, she said that, as the delegations had not yet been able to agree on the nomination of Vice-Presidents, it would no doubt be preferable to postpone the election to a later meeting.

Mr. CHIKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deplored the discriminatory nature of the invitations sent out for a Conference whose object was essentially universal. He thought it inadmissible that a country like the German Democratic Republic, which had done so much to counter the re-emergence of Nazism and had recently enacted a basic law proclaiming the rights of workers, should not be represented and that no invitations had been extended to sovereign States which, although not at present Members of the United Nations, were nevertheless entitled to take part in the work of the Conference. The situation was all the more iniquitous in that the seats to which those States were entitled were in fact occupied by representatives of governments artificially supported by certain Western States, governments which could not in any way be considered as the legitimate governments of China, Vietnam and Korea.

Mr. Tsing Chang LIU (China) registered his delegation's strong objection to the remarks of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the representation of China. He pointed out that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legitimate Government of China freely elected by the people of the whole of China according to the Constitution of the country, and was recognized as such by a majority of the Sovereign States of the world, as well as by the United Nations and all its specialized agencies. Furthermore, the General Assembly alone had the power to settle the question, which was outside the competence of the Conference.

<sup>4/</sup> The text of these messages appears in the Final Act of the Conference, annex III, I, J and K.

Mr. RESICH (Poland) considered it inadmissible that, twenty years after the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the People's Republic of China and the German Democratic Republic were still denied the right to take part in the work of a Conference which concerned them as much as other States.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that, in the opinion of the French Government, the place reserved for China should be occupied by a representative of the Government of the People's Republic of China and not by a representative of the Taipeh authorities.

Mr. BUU (Republic of Viet-Nam) said that his Government was a legitimate and democratic one and had been elected by the people of South Viet-Nam as a whole, whose will had been freely expressed at the 1966 and 1967 elections. The constituent assembly then elected had adopted a constitution whose articles 1 to 29 reproduced almost all the human rights set out in the 1948 Universal Declaration.

Mr. Suh Chan LO (Republic of Korea), replying to the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the Republic of Korea had been set up in 1948 under the auspices of the United Nations and that the people had expressed their will at general elections; the United Nations had recognized the legitimacy of the elected government in the same year. The Republic of Korea, which contained more than two-thirds of the Korean people, had diplomatic relations with eighty States and was a member of several specialized agencies and of more than one hundred international organizations. The Conference had been convened to promote and protect fundamental human rights, and it would be distressing if valuable time were wasted in political discussions which were outside its competence.

Mr. OULD EREBIH (Mauritania) regretted that 700 million Chinese were systematically barred from international organizations, and in particular from the Conference, to the work of which they could have made a useful contribution. He added that it was astonishing that States which refused to apply General Assembly resolutions and openly flouted human rights had not realized that they were out of place at the Conference.

Mr. WILKINS (United States of America) pointed out that the General Assembly had decided on the participation of States in the Conference. All States Members of the United Nations family of organizations, including the Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Viet-Nam and the Federal Republic of Germany, were entitled to be represented at the Conference. He called upon the Conference to refrain from political discussion and proceed with its work.

Mr. YAZID (Algeria) said that the internal situation in the countries concerned should be taken into account in the decision concerning the participation of States in the Conference. For example, the puppet government of Saigon could not be accepted as representing the people of South Viet-Nam, who were courageously fighting for their independence. Nor could the representative of the Taiwan government be considered as the legitimate representative of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. DAUDY (Syria) regretted that important and sovereign States, such as the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, and the Democratic Republic of Korea had not been invited to the Conference. He protested against the presence at the Conference of the representative of the Government of Israel, which was guilty of numerous violations of human rights and of aggression against States Members of the United Nations and which was following a policy of terror and intimidation towards the Arab minorities and the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories.

Mr. WAMBURA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the meaning of human rights should be defined. If those words had any meaning, how could one speak of human rights when the doors were closed to the representatives of 750 million human beings entitled to take part in the work of the Conference? As a member of the international community, Tanzania deplored that situation.

Mr. MASUD (Pakistan) said that his delegation could not accept the presence of the representative of the Tel Aviv government at a Conference whose object was to promote the respect of human rights. He added that the Chinese people could only be represented at the Conference by an envoy from the People's Republic of China.

Mr. ZELTNER (Israel) protested at the accusations made against his Government. In reply to the representative of Syria he said that in 1967 the Syrian radio had broadcast a call for the extermination of the Jews in Palestine. As to the treatment of the Arab minorities, he said that the Arabs living in Israel and Israel-occupied territory had a higher standard of living than those in the Arab countries and enjoyed more rights than the inhabitants of any other Arab country.

Mr. KASSE (Mali) said it was regrettable that seats at the Conference were occupied by persons who represented only themselves, instead of by the true representatives of the peoples of Viet-Nam, China and Korea.

Mr. BYSTRICKY (Czechoslovakia) said that the Declaration of Human Rights had been called "universal" and not "international" in order to emphasize its true intention. Some ten years ago the United Nations had itself published a booklet defining the concept

of universality. The policy of political discrimination pursued by the United Nations, which excluded a third of the world's population from the Conference on Human Rights, contradicted that principle.

Mr. DAUDY (Syria) stated that he had too much respect for the ideal inspiring the dignity and the work of the Conference to use terms such as "contempt" which were used by the representative of the Tel Aviv authorities. The record of the occupying forces in Palestine was a series of aggressions and violations of every norm of decency and human rights. With regard to the alleged broadcast by Radio Damascus, inciting the Arabs to be vigilant, he pointed out that prior to that time the Chief of the General Staff of the Israeli Army had announced his Government's intention of invading Syria and occupying Damascus. It was natural, therefore, that the Syrian people had to be warned.

Furthermore, the remarks about the higher standard of living of Arabs in occupied areas confirmed what the Arabs had always said, namely, that Israel was a colonialist in the Arab homeland. What other argument did the Portuguese and the white racists in South Africa and Rhodesia use to justify their presence in those territories, except that of raising the standard of living of the original inhabitants of the land?

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said he shared the views of those representatives who had affirmed that only representatives of the People's Republic of China were entitled to represent the Chinese people at the Conference. He agreed with what the Syrian representative had said about Israel and mentioned that Iraq had hesitated to send a representative to a Conference in which a country with unclean hands would be participating. He considered such participation as an affront to the United Nations as a whole and to the Conference in particular. Referring to the Radio Damascus broadcasts which had been criticized, he mentioned a Tel Aviv newspaper report of a survey conducted amongst children of school age before the events of June 1967, which had shown that 98 per cent of those under the age of fifteen years thought that all Arabs should be massacred. He considered that highly revealing of the feelings of hatred against the Arabs in the population of the country in question and stated that such a country had no right to give lessons in the observance of human rights.

Mr. YAZID (Algeria) felt that Algeria, as an Arab country, had been incriminated by the person speaking on behalf of Tel Aviv. The real debate between Israel and the Palestinian people was taking place elsewhere. The Palestinian people was struggling to assert its right to exist and to free its territory, and the right of every country to economic, political and social justice as evoked by H.I.M. the Shahinshah in his address inaugurating the Conference. He was convinced that, thanks to the Palestinian resistance movement, it would be Palestine which would take part in the future work of the international community.

The persons speaking on behalf of Tel Aviv, in referring to the satisfactory standard of living of Arabs in occupied territory, had seemed to want to give lessons to certain countries. Algeria knew by experience that countries which had fought colonialism encountered serious economic difficulties, due to the loss of capital and technicians, and that such difficulties were the price of independence, as the countries of Africa and Latin America also knew. There was no doubt that, with will and effort, the countries of the Third World - today the proletarians of the international community - would overcome their difficulties.

Mr. MEDANI (Sudan) said he greatly deplored the presence of delegates from South Korea, South Viet-Nam and Formosa as representatives of the peoples of Korea, Viet-Nam and China at the Conference. The People's Republic of China, which Sudan was proud to have recognized, was alone entitled to represent the Chinese people. Furthermore, he drew the attention of a gathering that had met to uphold human rights to the atrocities of which Arabs in occupied territories were victims and to the disastrous condition of refugees in those territories. Clearly, those were flagrant violations of human rights.

Mr. ZELTNER (Israel) said that the use by previous speakers of terms such as "the person speaking on behalf of Tel Aviv" or "a country with unclean hands" showed the lack of a conciliatory spirit in certain quarters.

As regards the so-called justified statements by Radio Damascus, he pointed out that Israel had attacked no one and that it was not his country that had asked the Secretary-General to withdraw the United Nations forces from the area. As to the alleged statement by the Chief of the General Staff of the Israeli army that Israel had intended to occupy Damascus, he said that Israel had not done so, although such an action would probably have been feasible.

Mention of the standard of living of Arabs in Israel had given rise to criticism but just as much criticism would have been levelled had nothing been said. Observers for international bodies in the area had seen that the Arab population was not being exploited. The Jews, themselves oppressed for so long, would not oppress other peoples.

He asked for particulars of the alleged atrocities which, according to one representative, were being committed against Arabs in occupied territories. The representative in question was hardly qualified to utter such allegations; perhaps he could say how many Negroes had been massacred in his country over the past few years and what he meant by genocide.

APPOINTMENT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (item 6 of the provisional agenda)

The PRESIDENT said that under article 4 of the draft rules of procedure a Credentials Committee should be appointed at the beginning of the Conference, consisting of nine members to be appointed by the Conference on the proposal of the President. The Committee was to examine the credentials of representatives and report to the Conference without delay.

She suggested that, having regard to the composition of the Credentials Committee appointed by the General Assembly, the Committee for the Conference should consist of the representatives of Ceylon, Ireland, Japan, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay and the United States of America.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT requested the Credentials Committee to report to the Conference as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.