

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

held on Wednesday, 1 May 1968, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. WILLIAMS

Jamaica

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Williams (Jamaica), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

REVIEW OF THE 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 (agenda item 9) (A/CONF.32/4, A/CONF.32/5 and Add.1, A/CONF.32/7 and Add.1 and 2, A/CONF.32/8-10, A/CONF.32/12/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/13 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/16, A/CONF.32/L.9-L.11) (continued)

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS AT THE INTERNATIONAL AND THE REGIONAL LEVELS (agenda item 10) (A/CONF.32/6 and Add.1) (continued);

- (a) INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS: CONVENTIONS, DECLARATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS;
- (b) IMPLEMENTATION MACHINERY AND PROCEDURES;
- (c) EDUCATIONAL MEASURES;
- (d) ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

General debate (continued)

Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that the Conference should endeavour among other things, to adopt measures to promote and ensure respect for human rights. That principle was becoming increasingly important in contemporary international law. In 1948, when the General Assembly had adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Mongolia had not yet become a Member of the United Nations and had been unable to take part in the preparation of the text, but the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration were in complete harmony with those embodied in the Mongolian Constitution.

From the time of its admission to the United Nations, the People's Republic of Mongolia had constantly advocated better protection of human rights. It had also acted as host to the human rights seminar for the member countries of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE).

The 1921 revolution had put an end to colonial domination and feudal oppression. The People's Republic had been proclaimed in 1924 and had adopted its first democratic constitution, which had abolished serfdom and introduced universal suffrage for the working people. The Constitution had been amended in subsequent years as a result of the tremendous socio-economic changes in the country. Under the provisions of the new Constitution, which dated from 1960, the citizens of the People's Republic of Mongolia enjoyed equal rights without distinction as to sex, race, nationality, religion or social origin and position, including the right to employment, education, leisure and paid holidays. They were entitled to maintenance in old age, disablement and sickness and in the event of the death of the head of the family.

The Constitution provided that all inhabitants of Mongolia, regardless of their nationality, should enjoy equal rights in all sectors of the economic, cultural, social and political life of the country. Any form of direct or indirect limitation of the rights of citizens on grounds of nationality or race was forbidden by law. The Mongolian Constitution did not merely proclaim rights; it created the conditions necessary for their enjoyment. Thanks to the rights and freedoms guaranteed to them, every individual was able to apply his talents and use his knowledge in any sector of the economic and cultural life of the country.

It was deplorable that twenty years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, and despite the efforts made by the United Nations and its Member States, flagrant violations of human rights were still occurring in many parts of the world. In South Africa, South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies, the indigenous inhabitants were deprived of their most elementary rights and freedoms and the same situation prevailed in the Arab territories occupied by Israel forces, who were subjecting the people to the most cruel repression. It was highly regrettable that certain States which claimed to be champions of human rights were supporting those racist and colonial regimes.

Nor could he fail to mention the case of Greece, where the arbitrary acts of the military regime constituted a flagrant violation of human rights. It was the same story in Viet-Nam where, not to speak of the methods used in the war against the Viet-Nameese people, the American aggression meant the denial of the rights of those people to self-determination and national sovereignty and of the right to decide their own fate without outside interference. Only the immediate cessation of the bombing and other acts of war would create the necessary conditions for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. In the United States itself, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms left much to be desired. Ample evidence of that was to be found in the recent assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

It was high time to take vigorous steps at both the international and the national level, to ensure better protection of human rights and to put an end to violations of those rights. Responsibility for implementing the Universal Declaration and other international instruments relating to human rights lay with Member States themselves. Only the State could guarantee the effective application of the principles set out in the Universal Declaration by enacting the appropriate legislative measures and creating the conditions necessary for their execution.

For that reason, the delegation of the People's Republic of Mongolia was against the creation of an additional supervisory body, the effectiveness of which, in the light of past experience was extremely doubtful.

Mr. UYAMA (Japan) stated that, although all those participating in the Conference did not share the same political convictions, they had come together for the sake of a common objective - the promotion of the principles proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. At one time the protection of human rights had been considered the exclusive concern of States, but the adoption of the Universal Declaration and other international instruments relating to human rights had strengthened the idea that the protection of human rights was the responsibility of the international community. Those instruments had laid down international standards for the scope and extent of the rights and obligations of individuals.

The Universal Declaration was not a legally binding instrument and was not even addressed explicitly to the States Members of the United Nations. Nevertheless a number of States had incorporated its principles in their legislative, administrative and other measures. The protection of human rights was one of the basic principles of the Japanese Constitution, article 13 of which stipulated that it was the responsibility of the State to take positive steps to ensure the respect of that principle. In February 1948 the Japanese Ministry of Justice had set up a Civil Liberties Bureau, with 9,200 Commissioners responsible for ensuring the protection of human rights throughout the country.

It was to be deplored that the exercise of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration and in other instruments was still far from being realized. South Africa was a case in point, and in fact two thirds of mankind were still living in deplorable conditions, suffering not only from hunger, poverty and disease but also because they were the victims of armed conflicts. Unless a substantial improvement was made in the economic and social condition of those people, it was pointless to speak of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The provisions adopted in that field could be effective only in a climate of political stability and in the framework of a strong administrative system and adequate economic and social conditions. All the measures adopted by the United Nations would remain a dead letter unless the individual countries made the necessary effort within their own borders. It lay primarily with each State to guarantee the protection of human rights, and the establishment of international control machinery would be useless unless the States assumed their responsibilities in that field. Efforts should be

concentrated in particular on education with a view to promoting respect for human rights among the general public and increasing the capability of those who were responsible for the protection of those rights in their respective countries. It was worthy of mention that in adopting the Declaration the General Assembly had called upon every individual and every organ of society to strive by teaching and education to promote respect for those rights and freedoms. For its part, the United Nations had played a considerable part in the matter of teaching and education with regard to human rights; since 1957 it had organized more than thirty regional and inter-regional seminars in various parts of the world and had granted fellowships in various fields relating to human rights. Reference should be made in that connexion to the Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, which had been established in Tokyo in 1961 by the joint efforts of the United Nations and the Japanese Government. A number of training courses had been organized with the participation of fellowship-holders from Asian countries. In the previous year, the Institute had launched the first pilot project for group training in the field of human rights.

The Conference was of particular importance in view of the unprecedented technical development which was taking place and which had already had, and would increasingly have, effects on the status of the individual.

It was the duty of the Conference to find the ways and means of restoring the dignity and rights of the individual, as enunciated in the Universal Declaration, and it was important that its work should be crowned with success.

Mr. NETTEL (Austria) expressed to the Government and people of Iran the sympathy of Austria on the occasion of the disaster which had befallen one of the provinces of Iran.

He noted with satisfaction that the documentation submitted by the Secretary-General and Secretariat of the United Nations provided a sound basis for the study of the various topics on the agenda. Mr. Ganji's report on apartheid (E/CN.4/949 and Add.1-5) was particularly valuable and deserved the utmost attention.

So far as human rights in Austria were concerned, the Austrian Code of Civil Law had recognized some 160 years earlier that all men had inherent rights and the right to be respected as human beings. The Code of Human Rights in force in Austria dated back to 1867 and ever since then Austrian law had contained provisions to prevent all possible violations of human rights.

In order to complete the system of implementation, Austria had ratified the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and had accepted the competence of the European Commission of Human Rights to receive individual petitions, as well as the compulsory jurisdiction of the European Code of Human Rights; in that way Austria had submitted to effective international control.

Though the system seemed to be nearly perfect, some specific problems still called for consideration and if possible for a solution. Among those problems were a comprehensive codification of human rights which would solve the problems arising from the invention of new technological and scientific methods that made it possible to interfere with the human personality, the problems of protection against violation of certain human rights by private persons, and the problems of the activities of Governments in the fields of civil or private law that might also lead to violations of the basic rights of the individual.

Austria had done a great deal to ensure the success of the International Year for Human Rights and hoped that the Conference - the first to deal exclusively with questions of human rights - would make the Year a success in keeping with expectations.

One of the duties of the Conference was to give the world a survey of the protection of human rights as it had developed from 1948 to 1966. In addition it should explain the actual position of the protection of human rights in the theory and practice of the United Nations and show what could be done to bring theory and practice into line. Besides the main political problems such as apartheid or the problems of refugees, there were some points of so general a nature that they too should be dealt with by the Conference, which might give the United Nations bodies concerned the necessary guidelines for further action.

Among those questions he referred in particular to the improvement of the implementation of the instruments relating to human rights. In that connexion he considered that the following matters should be dealt with:

(a) The need to set up an office of a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights or a regional system of high commissioners for human rights subordinated to a central office at United Nations Headquarters;

(b) The preparation of models for procedural rules concerning the reporting systems, the individual petition systems and the different ad hoc investigation organs as described in the documentation of the United Nations.

Another item that should be considered was the question of intensifying the struggle against racial discrimination throughout the world, as the term was defined in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Since racial discrimination had been recognized as one of the main evils in the modern world, nations should support with all their resources the efforts made by the United Nations to combat that form of discrimination; the means might differ according to the circumstances of the case. Not only were the public authorities requested to fight racial discrimination but individuals in their daily life should refrain from any discriminatory practices. The Conference should draw attention to the need to fight racial discrimination whatever its form and wherever it might arise.

Another problem, closely related to that of the right of asylum, was the right of everyone to leave his country and to return to his country, which had been referred to at the 6th meeting by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The recent adoption of the Declaration on the Right of Asylum had been a great step forward but the legal problems involved were such that a sound and universally international foundation for the institution was needed.

Two further points deserved special attention: better co-ordination of the diverse activities in the field of human rights, and better information and education concerning human rights.

The application of the Universal Declaration and the protection of human rights were now considered one of the main tasks of modern society, a fact which accounted for the growing number of institutions and organizations, both national and international and both governmental and non-governmental, dealing with that matter. There was consequently a risk of duplication and lack of co-ordination that might lead to wastage and dispersal of intellectual and financial means. Furthermore, difficulties might result from differences in definitions or from the possibility that one and the same case of violation of human rights might be referred to several bodies simultaneously.

In order to prevent such complication, the co-ordination of activities in the field of human rights was of the greatest importance; that applied primarily to the United Nations and its specialized agencies and the other international organizations, including the regional organizations which played a decisive part in the protection of human rights.

As the representative of Australia had said, after the period of codification should come the period of implementation and education.

Education in the field of human rights was most important. So long as human relations were overshadowed by distrust and suspicion, and so long as not all men were on a footing of equality, the codification of human rights and the implementation of the resulting instrument would continue to be defective. For those reasons the International Year for Human Rights and the Conference should be the starting point for a period of intensive education in the field of human rights at all levels with the aim of informing all human beings not only about their own rights but also about the rights of others.

Mr. BARRIA (Chile) said he was becoming convinced, in attending the meetings, that one of the great merits of the United Nations was that it afforded a forum in which States might express their opinions in complete freedom and carry on a dialogue as equals, while at the same time providing an opportunity for judging the customs and actions of governments and peoples.

All States shared a love of peace, abhorrence of war and the desire to improve the living conditions of their peoples. Chile, which was aware of that community of aspirations and had faith in the power of ideas and moral values, believed in the possibility of a constructive dialogue. Agreement could always be reached among men of goodwill.

In order to find common ground, ideological quarrels must be avoided, the co-existence of differing economic, moral and political conceptions tolerated and common ideals promoted. Human rights were prominent among those ideals. States and constitutions recognized man's right to live and enjoy all individual, civil and political freedoms. However, actions rarely were in keeping with principles. Too often considerations of the good of the State, its security, economic and political imperatives and concern for territorial and ideological supremacy were in opposition to the genuine exercise of those rights. Hence the role of the United Nations was to make individuals take cognizance of their responsibilities and act accordingly.

Its role, however, did not stop there. As a result of the evolution brought about by progress, man's situation on the planet had changed. Socio-economic relationships were no longer the same. There were now new rights, which it was the duty of the United Nations to recognize and promote.



With growing awareness of the problem of hunger and poverty, the right to health and food came to be linked with the right to live. It was being discovered that the exercise of rights and enjoyment of fundamental freedoms presupposed a certain level of education and culture and a minimum of economic achievement.

The inalienable rights of man as a social being and member of social groups and communities were gaining recognition along with the rights of the individual. Peoples had come to be aware of their right to take their fate into their own hands by taking an active and organized part in decisions concerning them.

It had long been thought that accession to sovereignty put an end to colonialism. It was now known that economic development was necessary for the final and genuine emancipation of peoples. The United Nations must make the world understand that the poor and less advanced peoples had a right to economic development. It should intensify its aid to the developing countries. The advanced nations, for their part, should become aware of their duties towards others. They should agree to buy raw materials at a fair price and to provide the poorer countries with financial and technical assistance enabling them to escape exploitation. For the less advanced peoples, economic development was an inalienable right, which was indispensable to the exercise of the other rights and to the reign of democracy in the world. The violence prevalent in the twentieth century was perhaps the fruit of despair: only justice could remedy it.

He then described his country's achievements in the field of human rights. Chile, which had been independent for a century and a half, was proud of its democratic traditions, which were set down in its Constitution and laws and were observed in practice. Men and women had the same rights. Chile, a country of asylum, traditionally admitted the victims of political persecution and extended the same treatment to foreigners as to citizens.

The present Government had undertaken to transform economic and political structures within the limits compatible with the play of democratic principles and with limited resources. The goal of that programme of "Revolution in Freedom" was the country's economic liberation and development.

In the field of education, the duration of primary schooling had increased from six to eight years and the proportion of children enrolled from 83 to 92 per cent. The number of pupils had doubled in three years. An accelerated programme had made it possible to train 8,000 teachers. Adults could take part in vocational training courses.

Agrarian reform had altered both the land-tenure system and farming techniques. Thanks to the change in land-tenure structures, 1,200,000 hectares of land belonging to 600 owners had been expropriated and divided among farm labourers. Experts from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had noted that production and productivity had improved and that the farmers lived better.

However, it was primarily in the field of political and social rights that Chile was proud of its innovations. A system of popular advancement and community organization gave the people an active part to play in the country's economic and social advancement. Rural committees and social centres for mothers were growing in number.

Chile, which was democratic in principle and in action, was hostile to all régimes which refused to respect equality and freedom. Although man would soon reach the moon, apartheid and political and economic colonialism persisted; millions were hungry and the rights of women and children too often remained a dead letter. That was a scandalous situation. International opinion and youth in particular expected the United Nations to take action. Mankind would not find its path and live in peace until such time as all men were equal.

Mr. KANYEIHAMBA (Uganda) also pointed out that, twenty years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, thousands of southern Africans were being detained and persecuted. Those men, whose only crime was that of struggling to secure a minimum of rights, were the victims of régimes inspired by the erroneous principle of racial superiority and of their accomplices, the so-called developed nations, which had enormous vested interests at stake. Did not Smith and Vorster receive considerable moral support from those countries, knowing that there would be neither armed confrontation nor economic sanctions? They were, of course, condemned in principle, but when action was called for, no one stepped forward. Uganda was extremely scandalized by the wickedness of certain western Powers which continued to furnish military, economic and moral assistance to South Africa, thereby encouraging it to intensify its criminal policy of apartheid; it was scandalized but not defeated, for although the racists were strong in arms, their adversaries were strong in justice. The accomplices of South Africa were as guilty as the racists in Pretoria because without their support, the South Africans would long ago have been freed from apartheid.

Turning to the work of the United Nations in the human rights field, he noted that there were numerous instruments dealing with the subject, the most important

being the Universal Declaration, which proclaimed that all human beings were born free and equal in dignity and rights. However, equality was far from being achieved, and discrimination based on differences of race, sex, religion, colour, nationality or ideology were too often the order of the day. Had not a country which had long been regarded as the champion and guardian of democracy and human dignity recently enacted an immigration law which authorized discriminatory practices?

Uganda, which had been independent for six years and which was faced with internal difficulties which were often the legacy of colonialism, respected the great objectives of the Declaration in principle and in fact. Its constitution recognized and protected fundamental freedoms and rights. National policy sought to achieve national unity so that poverty, ignorance and disease might be overcome and living conditions improved. Stability based on respect for human rights was the sine qua non for implementing such a policy.

His country had ratified twenty International Labour Organisation (ILO) Conventions, and in the field of human rights it had also ratified the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, the International Slavery Convention of 25 September 1926 and the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery.

It planned to ratify the remaining instruments and was also concerning itself with the problem of refugees.

With respect to women's rights, the President of Uganda had recently proclaimed that women in the public service would in future enjoy the same rights and advantages as men, without prejudice to the advantages connected with maternity. The private sector was following the example of the public service.

Lastly, he stated that, with certain reservations, his country was prepared to support the establishment of an International Court of Human Rights and the appointment of a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. He proposed the following programme:

- (1) The establishment of a body similar to the ILO Committee of Experts, of which the High Commissioner for Human Rights would be the chief executive officer.
- (2) Compulsory reports by States Members of the United Nations to the High Commissioner on the application of human rights conventions.
- (3) Compulsory reports by the United Nations specialized agencies on their member States not Members of the United Nations.

- (4) Reports by Member States on measures being taken to apply as yet unratified conventions and on obstacles to their ratification.
- (5) Examination by the Committee of Experts of the reports and information after co-ordination by the High Commissioner.
- (6) Communication of the Committee's report to the Member States and to the General Assembly, which could require certain States to explain their position.
- (7) Communication of the report after adoption either directly to the Member States concerned or through United Nations specialized agencies, which would draw their attention to recommendations requiring action.
- (8) Where necessary, the lodging of complaints by the High Commissioner with the future International Court of Human Rights against Member States refusing or failing to observe the recommendations.
- (9) The right of Member States and non-governmental organizations to lodge complaints with the International Court of Human Rights against States persistently violating the principles of human rights.
- (10) Sanctions by the Security Council against Member States refusing to respect the binding verdicts of the Court.
- (11) Amendment of the Charter of the United Nations to introduce articles similar to articles 19 and 22 of the Constitution of the ILO, which would require Member States to make reports and provide information on the application of the Conventions.

He considered it essential that the United Nations should adopt measures along those lines if it wished the struggle for the respect and promotion of human rights to be effective.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that his delegation and Government were greatly disturbed at the news of the disaster that had just struck the host country, and expressed his deepest sympathy.

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration, the community of nations should review the succession of human rights activities, make any necessary improvements and outline a programme for the future.

His delegation was gratified at the enormous achievements of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and commended the vast amount of codification work done. Numerous covenants and conventions dealing with the essential aspects of human rights had been formulated and adopted almost unanimously, and the General Assembly had adopted many resolutions on human rights questions. All those instruments reflected the international community's concern with implementing and safeguarding human rights.

However, twenty years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, the psychological foundations for a new order had still not been laid. Colonialism was still rampant in the world despite United Nations action. Millions of human beings were still deprived of their rights to self-determination and independence. Unfortunately, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had remained a dead letter for certain countries that rejected international co-operation and refused to rid themselves of prejudices degrading to the human person.

The Secretary-General's message to the Conference and the various statements made reflected the international community's concern at the slow process of decolonization. Adequate steps should be taken today to encourage the whole community of nations to preserve the high values of present-day civilization and blaze the trail for loyal and sincere international co-operation based on equality, justice and human solidarity.

Another crucial matter was the attitude of the Pretoria Government in blindly pursuing its policy of racial segregation and continuing to practice apartheid at the expense of a large section of the population of South Africa and the territories of South West Africa it had appropriated. It scorned United Nations recommendations and systematically refused to heed the demands of the international community. The time had come to make that Government listen to reason and to induce it to resume its place in the community so as to be able to play its part in promoting human rights, in accordance with the principles of the Universal Declaration.

Likewise, the drama which had caused the Palestinian people such suffering for over twenty years should not be ignored. Driven from their national territory by fire and sword, they were living under disgraceful conditions on the fringe of their fatherland, deprived of their possessions, which had been usurped by an invader preaching racial discrimination and practising violence to further its expansionist aims.

It was vital that the Conference should concern itself with the fate of millions of human beings who lived in total negation of their most elementary rights, and should take adequate measures to enable them to recover their dignity and take their place within the community of nations. The Conference should leave nothing undone which might help to restore and safeguard human rights wherever they were denied.

Moreover, as H.I.H. The Shahinshah of Iran had pointed out, economic, cultural and social rights, as well as political rights, played their part in the full development of human dignity. President Bourguiba had stated that while man could

have no dignity so long as he lived under colonial domination, he could likewise have no dignity so long as he suffered from hunger, disease and ignorance.

The experience of the past twenty years showed that the fight against underdevelopment was also a collective venture which required the contribution and mobilization of all and would in the end benefit not only countries currently in the process of development but the whole of mankind. The Conference should use all possible means to encourage international co-operation, the implementation of the Covenants on economic, social and cultural rights and the effective observance of human rights.

The essential aim was to ensure respect of the dignity of all men, without distinction as to race, sex, religion, colour or language. Before mankind's moral values foundered through neglect, it was imperative to take steps to strengthen human solidarity and thus remove all obstacles to the furtherance of co-operation between peoples.

The Conference should not destroy the hopes that men had placed in it; it was its duty to lay the foundations of a new order, free from the effects of selfishness and vanity, in which man would be considered not as a means but as an end in himself.

Mr. WILSON (Liberia) expressed hope that the Conference would be the beginning of a universal and concerted effort to end the many violations of human rights in all fields, and would rekindle the flame of hope that had been lit with the promulgation of the Universal Declaration in 1948.

His delegation assumed an attitude of cautious optimism. If the Conference was to be a success, delegates should realize that peace and the full implementation of the Universal Declaration required that all races, religions and peoples should accept the differences between individuals and groups and realize that no one had the right to set the yardstick for the rest of the world.

The Constitution of Liberia, written one hundred years before the promulgation of the Universal Declaration, had already proclaimed the rights and freedoms set out in the Declaration, and the Liberian Government had followed a policy designed to safeguard those rights. His Government's accession to the Universal Declaration and to several international human rights conventions, and its desire to seek international co-operation in setting a universal standard was further indication of the importance it attached to human rights.

However, although there were many international conventions on human rights and many States Members of the United Nations had declared their good intentions, some were still reluctant to put those intentions into practice. Almost twenty years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, the dignity of the black man was still ignored in Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and the Portuguese overseas Territories. Recognition of fundamental human rights was incompatible with the objective of racial subjugation pursued by the racist minority in power. The big Powers with the military and economic strength to put an end to those inhuman practices limited themselves to words of condemnation, but the time had come for action.

Some nations would like to regard the problem of human rights as a domestic matter. However, one of the purposes of the United Nations was to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace. Racial discrimination and the other abuses of human rights were not only contrary to the principles of the Charter, but set the stage for a world-wide conflict with all its accompanying horrors.

International tensions, ideological conflicts and political revolutions perpetrated by foreign subversion had adversely affected human rights and led to a mass exodus of innocent peoples, executions and summary judgements. Local and regional quarrels had also impeded the implementation of human rights. The world could ill afford a continuous disregard and abuse of such rights by States which refused to conform to the principles of the Universal Declaration.

His delegation therefore called upon States participating in the Conference not merely to pay lip service but to strive to make human rights and fundamental freedom a reality. It was their duty to rekindle man's hopes for peace, justice and equality.

Raja Aznam bin Raja Haji AHMAD (Malaysia) said that the fact that the Conference was being held was ample evidence of the universal interest in human rights. It was both a commemoration of the signing of the Universal Declaration and a stock-taking of what had been accomplished and what remained to be done. In view of the scope of the subject he would pinpoint only the most flagrant violations, elimination of which was an urgent necessity, to put an end to the sufferings of the victims.

The most intolerable of those violations were probably the apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa and the unilateral declaration of independence by the illegal regime of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia, which were threats to peace

and security in those regions. Although in the past twenty years many countries had achieved independence, the African people of those two territories had neither the prospect of true independence for their country nor the benefits of basic human rights for themselves. They appeared to be doomed to perpetual subjugation. The apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa was an affront to the United Nations and to twentieth century civilization in general, and it was to be deplored that the various United Nations resolutions on that subject had not been implemented. However, it was to be hoped that other forms of persuasion might be found to put an end to the situation. His delegation wished to reiterate its appeal made the previous year in the Kitwe Seminar on Apartheid, Racial Discrimination and Colonialism, calling on the major trading partners of South Africa to comply with the United Nations resolutions on economic sanctions.

There was a striking contrast between certain countries that had already ventured into outer space and others which, from the point of view of human rights, had not even left the launching pad. He hoped that the world would have the resourcefulness to bridge that gap. His delegation was convinced that more co-operation on the part of the major trading partners of South Africa could help to tilt the balance in favour of the victims of racial discrimination, thus contributing towards the success of the Conference, the International Year for Human Rights and the effective implementation of the Universal Declaration. Many speakers had proposed various measures for future action in that field; some had even appealed to the conscience of nations, but it was probable that those perpetrating the violations had no conscience.

The other item which merited urgent consideration was the plight of refugees, in particular the Palestine refugees, who within the past twenty years, i.e. since the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had three times been forced to leave their homes, with all the hardship and suffering that that involved. As the High Commissioner for Refugees had said at an earlier meeting, the best solution would be for refugees to return voluntarily to their original country of domicile. Unfortunately the Palestine refugees must find it difficult to accept that solution. The military aggression of June 1967 had further aggravated the problem, and unless a solution was forthcoming there would be an almost perpetual refugee problem in the region. Apart from the need for a political solution the Palestine refugees should also receive more sympathetic consideration by member States and individuals alike and assistance should be forthcoming either directly or through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).



On a more general plane, the Conference should consider access to education by the under-privileged youth of the world. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) report (A/CONF.32/10) was hopeful in that respect. His delegation also noted with satisfaction that some young people in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, who had fled to neighbouring countries or had been deprived of a proper education because of the repressive laws in those countries, had obtained from other Governments facilities, financial or otherwise, to enable them to study.

While his country had been unable to join the architects of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as it had not then been an independent country, it had always upheld the spirit of and practised the principles set out in the Declaration. Racial harmony and religious tolerance prevailed in his country, and there was a steady progress towards full equality of the sexes in the political, economic and social fields.

In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Conference would not fall short of expectations and that the States represented would take positive and practical measures, both singly and collectively, to make the "laurel and flame" emblem of the Conference a pledge of its success and a beacon lighting the way to a brighter future.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland), exercising the right of reply, apologized for having to speak once again to supplement what he had said on the previous day and to answer the attacks made on his country by the Israel representative. Describing the situation of the Jewish community in Poland, the latter had said that "the death camps of Poland formed a monstrous roll of dishonour on Polish soil". Was the inference to be drawn from that statement that the many other European countries whose Jewish communities had been exterminated were likewise responsible for such massacres? Such words did no credit to the person who uttered them. They showed that the Israel representative had a very poor knowledge of history and a short memory. Dignity and the national pride of the Polish nation forbade that it should defend itself against the slanderous accusations made against it by Zionist and imperialist propaganda. His country's long tradition of tolerance was well known; Poland was not the country where the fires of the Inquisition had once burnt, and it was no accident that for the past 700 years the Polish territory had welcomed Jews from all parts of Europe. Poland had done its duty during the war as a nation and as an ally, on the battlefield and in the camps. The death-roll of Poles who had died in the fight against fascism was very long. The cynicism of Zionist propaganda was

evident from the fact that it operated even inside the Conference Hall and did not hesitate to evoke the memory of the millions of Nazi victims in support of its slanders and as a pretext for the infamous accusation that the Polish nation had played some part in the mass murders committed by the Nazis. Hitler had chosen Poland for his mass murders because he thought that Poland, which had the largest Jewish community, was the first nation that had to be annihilated. That was why six million Polish and Jewish citizens had been killed on Polish soil. His country honoured their memory, whatever their nationality or origin, as it honoured the memory of those who had taken up arms against Nazism. Tens of thousands of Jews owed their escape from the hell of the ghetto solely to the help of the Polish people. Those who were today making infamous attacks on his country should remember that. By what right were the Israel delegation and the Zionists criticizing Poland's attitude towards minorities? Perhaps they would do better to devote their attention to the fate of the Arabs living in territories occupied by Israel.

In view of the racism shown by Israel leaders towards the coloured Jews from Asia and North Africa who had been attracted to Israel to supply labour, how could those leaders claim to give lessons in political morality to his country? He referred to the inertia of the Zionists and the Western Powers, who had made no effort to go to the help of the Jews exterminated in the gas chambers; those same people were today indiscriminately censuring the entire Polish nation, charging it with what they termed "traditional anti-semitism".

In conclusion, he said he sincerely hoped that the Israel delegation would cease making libellous and unfounded attacks on his country and that his delegation would not again have to demand the right of reply.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), speaking on behalf of his Government and the Iranian delegation, wished to thank most sincerely all those delegations who had expressed their sympathy in connexion with the recent earthquake in his country. He would pass on their condolences to the families who had suffered.

Although despite technical progress, men were still impotent in the face of natural catastrophes, they could at least refrain from deliberately inflicting misfortune on each other.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.