

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

held on Wednesday, 24 April 1968, at 10.55 a.m.

President: H.I.H. Princess Ashraf PAHLAVI Iran

SPECIAL MESSAGES ADDRESSED TO THE CONFERENCE

At the President's request, Mr. SCHREIBER (Executive Secretary of the Conference) read out the text of a message received from the Government of Peru under the signature of the Minister of Foreign Relations.^{6/}

REVIEW OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED AND IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED, AT THE INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LEVELS, IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS SINCE THE ADOPTION AND PROCLAMATION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN 1948, PARTICULARLY IN THE PROGRAMMES UNDERTAKEN BY THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (item 9 of the provisional agenda) (A/CONF.32/8 and 9, A/CONF.32/10 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/12, A/CONF.32/13 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/16; A/CONF.32/L.9-L.11 (continued))

General debate (continued)

Mr. SALAS (Philippines) considered it a good augury for the success of the Conference that it was being held in a progressive country like Iran, which was actively engaged in far-reaching land reform and literacy programmes.

The principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had been embodied in many national constitutions; they represented the moral force backing individual, national and international decisions. The twenty years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration had shown that injustice could exist irrespective of political systems or material achievements. Promotion of human rights went beyond ideology and technology, and ways must be sought to ensure that the inherent principles were not invoked merely when it was convenient.

Concern for human rights was the most binding factor in human relations, and the bond could be progressively strengthened if every country set itself to apply the lofty principles affirmed in the Universal Declaration. It was to be hoped that a review of past accomplishments would serve to reinvigorate the resolve to eliminate prejudices, inequalities and injustices still existing. The most easily identifiable of the obstacles to universal application of the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration, assuming that national policy was disposed to their enforcement, was correct interpretation. Admittedly, the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had given greater precision to the abstract general definitions in the Universal Declaration, and some rights had been made the subject of separate conventions. Nevertheless, further studies were needed to define the scope of each of the provisions concerned, and the technique of using special rapporteurs was one that deserved to be endorsed in that connexion.

^{6/} The text of this message appears in the Final Act of the Conference, annex III, IV.

One formidable obstacle to the universal enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms was where national policy was inconsistent with or in violation of the Charter and the Universal Declaration, e.g. the present racist policies of some Governments and the anachronistic colonial and neo-colonial policies of a few others.

Such problems illustrated the difficulty of promoting human rights by national legislation. Where the legislation in itself involved violations, the remedy was amendment or repeal by government action. But where the obstacle lay in tradition or custom, the ultimate remedy would be re-education or reorientation of the masses, backed by legislation. Mass media and public information techniques were especially appropriate in such situations. In the same connexion, he would emphasize the important role of community development in ensuring that the under-privileged received their due share of the bounties of civilized society. His own country would be willing to share its experience and modest know-how in that field.

In 1966, the Regional Seminar on the Status of Women held at Manila had resolved to draw up long-term programmes for the advancement of women which he thought would greatly assist in the implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. By participating in the socio-economic development of their countries, women would hasten their full enjoyment of human rights; in recognition of that fact, the Philippines was creating a commission on the participation of women in national development in lieu of a commission on the status of women, and his country would watch with keen interest the progress of the long-term programme for women's advancement recently announced by Iran.

Special measures were sometimes warranted in order to allow cultural minorities to catch up with the dominant groups; but the protection of minorities should not go beyond such gestures of belated justice lest separatism or secession be encouraged. Basic rules sanctioned by the United Nations would go a long way towards preventing oppression or rebellion and thus maintaining the sometimes delicate and precarious balance.

One common feature of the plight of developing countries was that national will and self-reliance were often not enough to ensure the enjoyment of economic and social rights essential to a decent standard of living. There was a built-in apathy in the United Nations towards international assistance in promoting economic and social rights. The tactical mistake of separating those rights from civil and political rights in drawing up international covenants had created an unfortunate psychological

climate of acquiescence in the status quo in economic and social matters, making it even more difficult for the developing countries to obtain the requisite international assistance - witness the reluctance of the developed countries to contribute their due share toward fulfilment of the objectives of the United Nations Development Decade. Notwithstanding the basic principles of international co-operation between the developed and the developing countries formulated at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the second session of the Conference had found itself no nearer the goal of transforming accepted principles into living reality. The developed countries were well aware of the need to bridge the ever-widening gap in economic growth and production separating them from the developing countries; but the bitter fact was that they lacked the will or foresight to take the urgent action needed. It was time that article 28 of the Universal Declaration was implemented. By now, the developed countries must have realized that they could not long survive in peace and prosperity while more than two-thirds of the world's population was living in desperate want.

One lesson that had emerged over the past twenty years was that the concept of human rights was a dynamic and not a static one. During that period, the matter of enforcement of those rights had moved beyond the exclusive domestic jurisdiction of States. The aspirations of man to achieve the full enjoyment of human rights had become as irresistible a force as the drive of the colonial peoples towards self-government and independence. The international evolution of the concept demanded a parallel evolution in the techniques and procedures for the universal enforcement of human rights. Revision of discriminatory legislation and practices was no longer enough: the goal should be condemnation, prohibition and punishment of discrimination by law.

Overhaul of the United Nations bodies dealing with human rights was also called for. After twenty years, the bodies in question should surely be able to hear and investigate complaints against Member States concerning violations of the provisions of the Universal Declaration that lay outside the competence of the organs established by the international covenants and other international instruments on human rights. The Conference should formulate and adopt recommendations in that sense.

The world was said to be witnessing at the present time three revolutions of vital importance for the future of mankind: the technological achievements ushered in by man's mastery of the secret of the atom; the ideological conflict between capitalism and communism; and the revolution of rising expectations among

the emerging new nations. The Conference would fail in its purpose if it ignored the far-reaching implications of those three movements insofar as they affected the dignity and worth of the human being.

Mr. MESTIRI (Chairman, Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples) said that the General Assembly, by its resolution 2326 (XXII), had wished to give the Conference the opportunity of making an up-to-date assessment of the situation of the millions of human beings still under the colonial yoke.

The clause in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stating that the principles embodied therein should apply equally to colonial peoples might never have been adopted, to judge from its effect in the subject territories, where individual and collective freedoms were still being cynically violated and trodden under foot with impunity. How could the situation be otherwise, when the very philosophy of colonialism and the methods it used were directly opposed to the Declaration's ideas and principles? How could the notion of all human beings being born free and equal in dignity be accepted in the face of the belief in inferior subject races? Inequality based on race, colour, language and religion lay at the root of all the injustices and abuses practised in the colonial countries. And the colonial peoples, deprived of all other recourse, had in many instances been forced to resort to justifiable resistance against tyranny and oppression, thus bringing on themselves still greater measures of repression.

Items of particular interest for the work of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four included the International Covenants on Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 and 1967 respectively, and resolution 2144 (XXI), in which the General Assembly had expressed its growing concern regarding violations of human rights, including those practised under the policy of racial discrimination, segregation and apartheid, as applied particularly in colonial and dependent territories.

But the mere adoption of declarations and covenants was not enough: what was needed was ratification as appropriate and translation of the adopted principles into legally binding rules under national legislation. Regrettably, Member States had failed to take the necessary action as speedily as was desirable, but even so, it was of great significance that universal recognition was accorded within the United Nations to the right of every individual to respect for his dignity as a human being

in all spheres of life. Plainly, that was a prerequisite for the progressive attainment of universal peace and peaceful economic and social co-operation and development as laid down in the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations had thus come to feel a particular sense of urgency regarding the elimination of colonialism and the task of combating racial discrimination. The colonial situation in southern Africa was still characterized by the most flagrant and anachronistic mass violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. As the Secretary-General had recognized, the collective determination of the United Nations to bring colonialism to an end seemed to have come up against a solid wall of defiance in that part of the world. Nor had there been any abatement in the persistent violation of the right of self-determination; the national liberation movements were still being savagely repressed by the authorities concerned, in collaboration and collusion with certain vested economic and other interests.

The reasons for that state of affairs were not difficult to determine. They lay in the deliberate opposition and continuing non-cooperation of the administering Powers concerned and in the reluctance of certain other States to collaborate with the United Nations in applying effective solutions to outstanding colonial problems. The international community should not, and would not, accept that situation as irrevocable; it must redouble its efforts to eliminate colonialism in all its manifestations. The United Nations would remain the focal point for that noble endeavour, to which the Special Committee of Twenty-Four would, he was sure, continue to make a positive contribution. Indeed, on its initiative, the General Assembly had in recent years taken a number of decisions that marked a new and important stage in the development of the principles and the process of decolonization. Important steps included the expansion in 1965 of the concept of the inalienable rights of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence to include recognition of the legitimacy of their struggle to achieve effective exercise and enjoyment of those rights; and the Special Committee of Twenty-Four had appealed to all States to give the colonial peoples the moral and material support needed for that purpose.

In 1967, the Special Committee had noted with satisfaction the progress made by the national liberation movements in the territories under Portuguese administration, both in the basic struggle and in reconstruction programmes in liberated areas, and had asked that international assistance to the victims of Portuguese military operations be rendered in co-operation with those movements, thus implying recognition of the role the liberation movements could and should play in freed areas.

The increasing concern of the United Nations regarding colonialism was also reflected in the affirmation made by the General Assembly in 1965 and reiterated subsequently, to the effect that the continuation of colonial rule and the practice of apartheid, as well as all other forms of racial discrimination, threatened international peace and constituted a crime against humanity. In that context the Special Committee and the General Assembly had intensified efforts to enlist the active support and involvement of the Security Council in decolonization matters, by asking the Council to put into effect appropriate measures binding on all States and directed at the offending régimes in Southern Rhodesia, South-West Africa, the territories under Portuguese administration, and Aden to ensure the implementation of the relevant United Nations decisions.

Commenting on the close relationship and differences in emphasis that undoubtedly existed between the question of decolonization and the question of human rights, with particular reference to the elimination of racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa, he pointed out that the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples necessarily implied the exercise of the right of self-determination and the transfer of all powers to the colonial peoples concerned. Since the General Assembly had recognized in resolution 1850 (XVII) that racial discrimination and segregation in non-self-governing territories could be eradicated fully and with the greatest speed by the faithful implementation of that Declaration, it followed inescapably that the solution to the human rights problem insofar as colonial territories were concerned lay in the total and speedy implementation of the Declaration. He accordingly hoped that the Conference would strongly stress that aspect in its conclusions under agenda item 11 (b).

The urgency of the need for stronger action in regard to the colonial territories could not be over-emphasized, for several million people were still today living under colonial rule and mostly under régimes offering no hope of early emancipation. For those people, confidence in the United Nations might readily be replaced by bitter disillusion if effective action was long delayed.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that Iran was both an admirable host to the Conference and a living example of its theme. Under the leadership of H.I.M. The Shahinshah, it was carrying out a remarkable bloodless revolution which was steadily raising the social, economic and educational standards of its people, while maintaining the stability of the realm.

His delegation would make every endeavour to conform to the Secretary-General's plea for avoidance of political recrimination during the Conference. Unfortunately, issues arising out of the Middle East conflict, which was being dealt with by other competent United Nations organs, had been raised by representatives of Arab States, who had launched their customary vilifying attacks on his country in an attempt to discredit it. The Middle East situation had been discussed in the United Nations for six months in 1967, and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General was currently engaged in the delicate task of peace-making. Israel had welcomed the fact-finding mission sent to the conflict area in 1967 and would likewise welcome the new mission which the Secretary-General had asked the Governments involved in the conflict to agree to, since it had nothing to hide regarding the administration of Israel-occupied territories or the measures which the Israel Government was taking for the safety and welfare of the civilian population there. On the other hand, Israel was concerned about the ill-treatment of Jewish communities in Arab countries and was glad that that situation would also be covered by the fact-finding mission.

He would remind the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic that his observations on the Middle East situation reflected proposals which had been rejected by the United Nations. He hoped that the subject could be left to the appropriate United Nations organs to deal with. If not, there was a danger that the work of the Conference would be disrupted and prejudiced.

Over the past twenty years much solid work had been done to promote human rights at the international level; but that was not a reason for pious self-congratulation, for the hardest part of the task lay ahead. The United Nations could put forward great ideals more easily than it could convert them into reality. The norms of international behaviour it recommended became binding only to the extent to which sovereign States subscribed to them, and the precepts contained in the Universal Declaration were still a long way from being universal commitments.

United Nations concern with the subject of human rights had begun with the drafting of the Charter at San Francisco, at a time when Europe had just been freed from Hitlerism and all the bestiality of the Nazi system lay exposed. Tens of millions of people had been deprived of their most elementary rights as human beings on racial, religious or political grounds and it was considered essential to reaffirm the dignity and worth of the human person and to re-state the fact that human beings had the right to be free. Those concepts had accordingly been expressly written into the Charter, and the basic human rights and freedoms into the thirty articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In 1965 an important milestone had been reached in the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, and a convention on religious intolerance was now in draft form. However, it had not been considered practicable or desirable for the contents of the Universal Declaration to be developed in a piecemeal manner. Hence the task of spelling out its abstract principles in two comprehensive covenants had been undertaken with the aim of binding States to agreed international norms. The work had taken twelve years to accomplish, but an even more difficult phase had now been entered. The Universal Declaration had had great moral force, but only moral force. With the completion of the Covenants, Member States had to decide whether they were prepared to assume a binding commitment and to bring their own laws and practices into line with agreed international standards.

On the key issue of implementation, only the first experimental steps were being taken. In the case of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, signatory States were left to furnish their own reports. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provided for the establishment of an international committee, but it would not be competent to consider complaints by another State and still less by individuals, except in cases where the States concerned had voluntarily agreed to that procedure.

Israel had in the past supported the idea of a United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights and continued to believe that the concept could be reconciled with the principle of national sovereignty. The Commissioner could have a constructive influence without being a judge.

The Jewish people had made a distinctive contribution to the recognition of human rights and the dignity and personality of man, and contemporary civilization had drawn heavily on the inspiration of the Old Testament and the Hebrew prophets, with their insistence that all men were brothers and equal. When H.I.M. The Shahinshah had referred to Cyrus the Great as a pioneer of human rights, the Jewish people's struggle for liberty and nationhood in the same areas of the world thousands of years ago had at once come to mind. Iran and Israel represented two ancient and continuous civilizations with ties of history, culture and friendship that went back for twenty-five centuries. The region in which both States were located was one of rich diversity of race, nationality, faith, tradition and language and could never be exclusively identified with any one people or dominated from any one centre.

With the renewal of independent Jewish nationhood twenty years earlier, the Israel Declaration of Independence had guaranteed equality of social and political rights to all inhabitants of the State, which was to be based on freedom, justice and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel. Humanistic ideals had gained international validity with the general spread of enlightenment and liberal thinking after the French Revolution, and at the end of the First World War, they had been written into the Minorities Treaties. The emphasis at that time had been upon international protection of minority groups. What had been relatively overlooked had been the need for international protection of individual human beings, even if they made up the majority groups in any State. The significance of the United Nations Charter was that it treated all men and women on an equal footing. Yet there was room for concern lest the swing from minority rights to individual rights might have gone too far.

It was true that in recent years individual rights had been balanced by a major emphasis on self-determination and the right of each people to political independence. That process was perhaps the most striking event of the present age. Yet somewhere between the respective right of persons and of peoples there was also the right of a distinctive group within a State to maintain its own character and identity if it so chose. His delegation considered that in the broad advance on the human rights front, insufficient attention had been paid to that particular aspect. The sub-commission of experts set up in 1946 by the Commission on Human Rights to advise it on two related topics - the prevention of discrimination, and the protection of racial, national, religious and linguistic minorities - had stated at its first session that it understood the second of its tasks to be the protection of non-dominant groups which, while wishing in general for equality of treatment with the majority, desired a measure of differential treatment in order to preserve basic characteristics which they possessed and which distinguished them from the majority of the population. It was a pity that, after some initial studies the subject had been neglected by United Nations organs. The Sub-Commission itself had hardly touched upon it since 1954.

Israel's concern with that aspect of human rights was not simply academic but was reinforced by the tragic experience of Jewish minority groups elsewhere.

The Jews had survived as a distinctive people, with a common ethnic origin, common religion and shared traditions, culture and language. For many centuries and in many countries Jewish minorities had been persecuted for clinging to the

faith of their forefathers. But in Nazi-occupied Europe 6 million Jews had been sacrificed by the Nazis on the altar of their racial gods. It was little wonder that Jews remained intensively aware of fresh manifestations of anti-semitism. It was shocking to note that at the present time anti-Jewish sentiment had been revived for internal political purposes on soil soaked with the blood of Jewish victims of Hitlerism. The Jews also refused to take lightly any revival of neo-Nazi tendencies wherever they might occur. Moreover, they remained sensitive to the form of discrimination which denied to a minority group the free exercise of its own distinctive faith and culture and were deeply disturbed at the fact that a large section of the Jewish people were at present suffering from such cultural deprivation and did not enjoy even the same degree of religious autonomy as was still extended to other faiths. For those reasons his delegation welcomed the inclusion of article 27 in the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The subject was even more relevant to contemporary realities in 1968 than it had been in 1946. However, it was necessary to re-assess the classical approach to the question of minorities in one vital respect. People were far more conscious today of situations where the so-called dominant group was a minority and the so-called non-dominant group formed the majority of the inhabitants. That was the position in southern Africa, where apartheid and inequality were based on a claim to separate development. His people abhorred all discrimination based on race and totally rejected any doctrine or policy whereby a man's place in society was determined by the colour of his skin.

As far as group rights were concerned, the primary question was not whether a distinctive group within any State was a minority or a majority. The principle was that a distinctive group should be given the means of maintaining its own characteristics if it so chose, while at the same time its members should enjoy complete equality with other nationals of the State and owe the same duty of loyalty to the State itself. Unity could not be equated with uniformity; diversity should be regarded as enriching national life, not weakening it. His delegation urged that interest be revived in the special field of collective group rights.

It was well that expectations concerning the outcome of the present Conference should be sober. It was a fact that not many Governments were yet ready to accept international scrutiny of and intervention in the internal regulation of human rights in their countries. Nor did past history encourage the belief that the formulation of declarations or covenants could eliminate from the hearts of man the cruelty and greed, or the lust for power, privilege and domination, which lay at the root of the problem. The struggle for human freedom was never finally won. Yet it would be

wrong to be cynical or defeatist. By the most realistic assessment significant progress had been made by the United Nations in the last two decades, not least in the creation of a climate of international concern and a sense of international accountability transcending frontiers between States. At the present moment of taking stock, the steps forward already taken should be noted with satisfaction and an effort made to rise above the conflicts and overcome the barriers that divided man from man.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) said that, while the present Conference commemorated a great anniversary, the relevant General Assembly resolutions and the agenda for the Conference showed clearly that it was not an institutional commemoration. On the contrary, the Conference was asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the work done by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the field of human rights over the past twenty years. He himself had helped to prepare the Universal Declaration, and he was now asked to be a judge of what had been achieved since 1948; he was glad to welcome to Teheran a number of distinguished representatives who were in the same position. That showed the importance which States attached to the subject of human rights. He paid a tribute to those pioneers in the work that had led to the adoption of the Universal Declaration who were no longer living. The apostle of the peaceful struggle for respect for human rights - the Reverend Martin Luther King - would also be remembered long after his death.

The Universal Declaration had not only retained all its symbolic value but also had far-reaching moral and practical influence throughout the world. Inter-governmental treaties, national legislation, legal decisions and Constitutions referred to it and hundreds of millions of copies had been issued, in almost every language.

After twenty years, it was time for stock-taking. It was clear that the United Nations had done very useful work in the promotion of human rights, as the documents prepared by the Secretariat (A/CONF.32/5 and 6) showed. They gave a detailed description of the methods and techniques used by the United Nations and the specialized agencies and showed that they had fulfilled their commitments. An impressive number of declarations and covenants had given specific form to and supplemented the principles codified in 1948. It was now incumbent on States to accede to those instruments, to give them practical meaning at the national as well as the international level. The Conference should appeal urgently to all Member States to do so.

That was the positive side of the picture, however; in many parts of the world respect for human rights was not observed. Racism in its most hateful form, apartheid, was still practised in defiance of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. At a time when the most impressive scientific discoveries, particularly in the biological field, showed the absurdity of any racial prejudice, it was sad to see groups of human beings practising segregation of their fellow human beings because they were of a different ethnic origin.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, hundreds of millions of human beings were threatened by the spectres of hunger and disease. That was unjustifiable in view of the immense possibilities afforded by technological progress. Vast numbers of men and women who lived in ignorance were unable to share in the benefits of education and culture.

It was true that the United Nations and the specialized agencies were very much concerned about that intolerable situation; but the action which they advocated was not commensurate with the injustices which had to be fought against, and their efforts came up against insuperable barriers. He hoped that the Conference would pay particular attention to that aspect of the problem. It was essential to identify the obstacles preventing the full implementation of human rights rapidly and to work out effective remedies for overcoming them. There was nothing worse than disappointed hopes, and the disinherited masses had heard too many speeches and promises. Now they expected decisive action.

He considered that under-development was one of the most important topics to be dealt with by the Conference. Moreover, the Preparatory Committee had asked the Conference to pay particular attention to human rights problems in developing countries. His delegation considered that the promotion of human rights was directly related to economic and social progress. Unless the conditions necessary to ensure the most basic human rights, the right to adequate food, to health and education, were created it would be impossible to ensure full enjoyment of human rights in two-thirds of the world. He recalled what H.I.M. The Shahinshah had said on the subject in his book The White Revolution of Iran and in his inaugural address.

The world was divided into two groups - the rich and the poor - and the gap between them was widening. The Development Decade had not fulfilled its promises, and little had been achieved by the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. A tremendous effort was required by both rich and poor countries to

ensure that all the under-developed countries achieved a level of life compatible with human dignity. The Conference should advocate greatly increased assistance to developing countries and should urge the developed nations to adopt a really bold attitude which would find an echo in the less-developed countries.

Iran, under the leadership of its sovereign, was engaged in a great pacific revolution. It had abolished the feudal system by land reform. It had started a general programme of industrialization and of mechanization of agriculture. It was waging war on illiteracy. Its efforts were bearing fruit. In the last three years the annual growth rate had averaged 11 per cent and it was generally held that Iran had started well.

But the nature of the problems now preoccupying mankind made it necessary to consider them on a global basis. The promotion of human rights required international and general action. The obstacles should be overcome simultaneously. The United Nations was faced with the greatest task in history, to evolve a new method of international co-operation involving general development. The implementation of human rights could not be separated from other aspects of development. In the developed world a revolution of the greatest importance was under way, and the under-developed peoples would derive benefit from that progress; but if they were to benefit fully from it they would have first to reach a certain level of development, and there was no certainty that they would. The Conference would have to work out a long-term plan to overcome the greatest obstacle preventing the attainment of full human rights. His delegation intended to make some specific proposals to the Conference on that subject.

Mr. WILKINS (United States of America) said that he was grateful for the opportunity of meeting in Iran, a focal point in world history, and enjoying the hospitality of a progressive sovereign dedicated to the achievement of human rights.

During the Second World War, President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had proclaimed the "Four Freedoms": freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear, and all the human rights since enumerated were embodied within those four freedoms. Proclamation of the four freedoms during a total war had constituted a recognition of the truth later stated by President Kennedy, namely: what was peace but a matter of human rights? A secure peace could only be founded upon respect for human dignity. The authors of the four freedoms had recognized that civil and political rights and economic and social rights were interdependent and had enunciated the four freedoms to serve as an inspiration and a stimulus to the world.

In 1941, his country had possessed a political and civil framework within which injustice, though undeniably present, would not permanently endure; substantial progress had since been made towards fuller human rights. Outlining the path by which his country had progressed towards a fuller achievement of human rights, he said that in 1787, when the United States Constitution had been written, it had been very advanced for its time, but its protection had been limited to civil and political rights. From most of those rights one quarter of the population had been excluded as slaves and one half as women. In the 1860's, after the Civil War, the Constitution had been amended to abolish slavery, but the black man had soon found its promises illusory. Segregation, inequality and discrimination had persisted in other forms. From 1876 until 1947, the American ideal had remained a dream for the black man.

In 1947, shortly before the proclamation of the Universal Declaration, the report of the Civil Rights Commission had contained the revolutionary sentence: "Racial segregation must be eliminated from American life". An executive order had abolished racial segregation in all branches of the armed services in 1948, and from that date on the nation had moved from apathy to action.

In 1954 the Supreme Court had outlawed differentiation between citizens on the basis of race, and between 1957 and 1968, Congress had enacted five civil rights bills. Progressive as they were, those bills had not completed the fabric of human rights.

The attention focused by public information media on violations of human rights had destroyed apathy and spelt the eventual doom of discrimination in the United States. In 1964, federal law had opened up places of public accommodation to all Americans but the battle had not been completed, since poverty, often the end product of discrimination, prevented the enjoyment of newly-gained economic and social rights. The United States was now, however, beginning to implement the full range of economic and social rights, and despite the recent civil rights disturbances he had full confidence in the glittering future offered by his country to men of all creeds and races.

In the international field, more human rights had been proclaimed than had been implemented. The unlimited claim of national sovereignty was partly to blame; surely, under the United Nations Charter, no nation was entitled to wrong its own citizens. He did not agree with the view that the United Nations was not competent to discuss human rights violations except in Southern Africa, or in association with hostilities. His country, for example, had benefited from criticism in the United Nations forum. Much of it had been ill-informed, some even mischievous, but no actual harm had been done and much good had been accomplished.

What he had said did not detract from the United Nations efforts to wipe out colonialism and apartheid, and he predicted the end of apartheid in South Africa if South Africa were to survive. The United Nations, however, lacked the machinery to implement its human rights standards, and he had been deeply interested in the Costa Rican proposal for a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

At that meeting on the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights he was confident that in another twenty years great progress would have been made. Although there would be national differences, there would be aspirations for equality and opportunity which would overleap all boundaries. Change, both domestic and international, would require a commitment to action - in the words of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, "a commitment to action - compassionate, massive and sustained - new attitudes, new understanding, and above all, new will". That commitment and will must mark the way internationally if the world was to fulfil the promise of the unprecedented step taken by the United Nations in 1948.

Mr. HEINEMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that nearly two decades had passed since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a unique document of mankind's aspiration to freedom, and numerous international agreements had since confirmed the rights and freedoms which it proclaimed.

In his country, the universal significance of the International Year for Human Rights was recognized and respected. Only if the individual enjoyed the protection of human rights in his own country could those rights become effective in the international sphere and mutual trust reign in relations between nations.

Before the founding of the United Nations the securing of human rights had been a domestic affair of individual states, and international law had dealt only with relations between states. The transition from that epoch to the new epoch in which the individual came within the purview of international law was an extremely important stage of development. A similar trend could be observed within individual states, in that constitutional law now also concerned itself increasingly with the individual. That idea had been taken up with particular vigour in his own country due to the memories of a dark chapter in its history, and the Constitution enacted in 1949 proclaimed the principle of inviolable and inalienable human rights as the basis of every community, of peace and of justice in the world.

It was thus obvious that the principles of the Universal Declaration had to a large extent become a living reality in his country's law. The ideas embodied in article 8 of the Universal Declaration had been put into practice - a step which

constituted an almost revolutionary development in the protection of human rights. Any person in the Federal Republic of Germany who claimed that his basic rights had been violated could now go to an independent court before which all public authorities must account for their actions in the same way as ordinary citizens.

The wide freedom granted to citizens of his country sometimes enabled extremist groups to give expression to views which were not to the liking of his Government. That was part of the price paid for liberty and did not mean that such extremist groups in any way represented the majority of Germans. He agreed with the Ukrainian representative in his condemnation of Nazism but did not share his views on the importance of Neo-Nazism in Germany.

In addition to civil liberties which were safeguarded by the judicial system, fundamental social rights were safeguarded under his country's new legislation; it had therefore been possible for his Government to accept the European Social Charter with only minor reservations. His country had also made considerable efforts to ensure international control of domestic basic rights by ratifying the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the Supplementary Protocol to the Convention on the Guarantee of Property, of the Rights of Parents, and of Free Elections. The rights and freedoms guaranteed in the European Conventions gave to every individual in the country, whether German or alien, the right to assert his claims directly before national courts.

In addition, his Government had made separate declarations recognizing the competence of the European Commission of Human Rights to deal with individual complaints and subjecting itself to the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights. The close relationship between the European Human Rights Convention and the European Social Charter on the one hand and the United Nations Covenants on Civil and Political Rights as well as on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on the other, would make it easy for his Government to accede to those Covenants as well. The same was true of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, which his Government intended to ratify in the near future.

His Government particularly welcomed the stress laid on the right of self-determination of nations in article I of the two Human Rights Conventions concluded in 1966. That right had opened up the way to independence for many States; moreover, it reaffirmed the right of those nations whose national unity had been torn

asunder by international events to decide freely about their political status and national unity. In that connexion he recalled the reference made by the President of the United Nations General Assembly in his message on the occasion of the International Year for Human Rights, to the need to guarantee respect for the personality of all nations and their right to choose their own social system without any interference from outside.

However gratifying the progress so far achieved, a really durable basis for peaceful co-operation between nations could only be created through constant progress in the field of human rights. Even today, twenty years after the proclamation of the Universal Declaration, acts were being committed which showed how much remained to be done for the full implementation of internationally recognized principles of human rights. The Conference should direct an appeal to world public opinion against force and cruelty in any form.

His Government supported the appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights and was convinced that a central agency of that kind would be of inestimable value.

With regard to racial discrimination, his Government, upon ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, had expressed itself as being fully in accord with the aims of that Convention, and it was determined to apply all its energy in counteracting any form of racial discrimination. His Government further intended to make a tangible contribution to the International Year for Human Rights by signing the 1966 Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights.

Mr. YAZID (Algeria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he felt bound to reject the unjustified attack made on the Arab States by an earlier speaker. The Arab States were inspired in their action by the highest humanitarian motives and could not be accused of injecting political considerations into the Conference's deliberations.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.