



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-eighth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 26 May 1970,
at 8.45 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 1

Social development (*concluded*) (E/4864)

1. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the recommendation contained in paragraph 16 of the report of the Social Committee (E/4864), as adopted at the previous meeting, said that his delegation, which, at the 635th meeting of the Social Committee, had abstained in the vote on the draft decision to replace draft resolution E/AC.7/L.562, had not changed its position and had therefore again abstained in the Council's vote on paragraph 16.

2. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation's position on the recommendation in question, which had already been stated in the Social Committee, remained unchanged. The Preparatory Committee was not an organ competent to make preparations for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Non-governmental organizations (E/4799 and Corr.1 and 2, E/4808, E/4867)

3. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of members of the Council to a note by the Secretary-General (E/4867) in which he informed the Council that he intended to place the following organizations on the Roster: the Association for the Advancement of Agricultural Sciences in Africa, the Organisation internationale pour le développement rural and the World Society of Ekistics.

4. He invited the Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to introduce the Committee's report.

5. Mr. JHA (India), introducing the report (E/4799 and Corr.1 and 2), recalled that the Council had requested the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to undertake a detailed review of the criteria for determining the circumstances in which consultative status could be granted to non-governmental organizations. Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), which defined the criteria, had been formulated on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.

6. During the Committee's session, it had considered 38 applications and reapplications for consultative status from non-governmental organizations, as well as five requests for reclassification (see *ibid.*, chap. II). It had also considered the following items referred to it by the Council at its

forty-sixth session: status of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (*ibid.*, chap. III), status of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) (*ibid.*, chap. IV), and a proposal by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the grouping of non-governmental organizations (*ibid.*, chap. V).

7. In view of the Committee's decision to dispense with summary records, the report to the Council was fuller than in the past and improvements had been made in its presentation in order to make it more easy to read. He drew attention, in particular, to chapter III, which reproduced the debate on the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations as accurately as possible. Chapters IV and V also reproduced in detail the views expressed on INTERPOL and the grouping of non-governmental organizations in the Committee.

8. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider document E/4799 chapter by chapter.

Section A of chapter II was adopted.

9. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the recommendation concerning the International Association of Ports and Harbours contained in Section B.

The Committee's recommendation was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Section B of chapter II was adopted.

Section C of chapter II was adopted.

10. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a vote on the recommendation concerning the International Christian Union of Business Executives, which was contained in section D.

Section D of chapter II was adopted by 20 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

11. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), speaking on section E, noted that the International College of Surgeons had not acquired consultative status with the World Health Organization, and suggested that the organization should not be placed in category II until it had been granted such status by WHO. It might be placed on the Roster.

12. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that, after the Committee had decided to recommend the organization for category II, further information had been placed before it, but it had decided not to reopen consideration of the status of the organization. The Council should adopt the Committee's recommendation.

13. Mr. FRANZI (Italy), supported by Mr. PHILON (Greece), said that the International College of Surgeons, which had a membership of approximately 15,000, should be placed in category II because of the assistance which it extended to the developing countries. Malaysia had recently requested the assistance of the organization in a surgeons' training programme. The organization also campaigned against air pollution.

14. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) agreed with the United Kingdom representative. He did not see how the Council could support the Committee's recommendation if WHO, which was in a better position to make a judgement on the organization, and UNESCO had refused it consultative status.

15. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) pointed out that WHO's decision had been determined solely by the provisions of its Constitution.

16. The Council's decision should be based on the Committee's recommendation that the International College of Surgeons should be placed in category II because of its activities in the developing countries.

17. Mr. GOUAMBA (People's Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation was undecided on whether it would support the Committee's recommendation. It was important to know if the activities of the International College of Surgeons in the countries of the Third World, particularly in Africa, came within the scope of the activities of the World Health Organization.

18. He also requested information on the Centro de Investigación para el Desarrollo Económico y Social.

19. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) referred the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo to document E/C.2/R.40, in which it was stated that the Centro, in co-operation with civil servants and government bodies, conducted research on all economic and social problems, and problems relating to business organization and management. The document also contained information on the International College of Surgeons.

20. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) proposed that, in order not to prolong the discussions unduly, no decision on the Committee's recommendation should be taken for the time being.

21. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that under the rules of procedure, as he understood them, the Council should first of all take a decision on the Committee's recommendation that the International College of Surgeons should be placed in category II.

22. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with article 66 of its rules of procedure, the Council was required to vote first on the United Kingdom proposal.

23. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) observed that, if the International College of Surgeons were placed on the Roster, it could later apply for category II status.

24. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that, before reaching its decision, the Committee had heard the representative of the

International College of Surgeons and the WHO representative; at that stage the Committee had found that there was no need to take account of the rejection by WHO which had been based on technical grounds.

25. His delegation recommended that the International College of Surgeons should be granted category II status which, in its view, was perfectly justified.

26. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) thought that the Council should endorse the recommendation made by the Committee, which had taken its decision with full knowledge of the facts.

27. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the proposal of the United Kingdom representative.

The proposal was rejected by 14 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

28. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a separate vote was taken on the recommendation concerning the International Organization—Justice and Development.

The Committee's recommendation was adopted by 17 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

29. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had asked for a separate vote on three organizations and that it had voted against those organizations being granted category II status, not because it was opposed to the aims and purposes of those organizations, but because, in its opinion, those organizations would have been more appropriately placed on the Roster.

Section E of chapter II was adopted.

Section F of chapter II was adopted.

Section G of chapter II was adopted.

30. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) recalled, with regard to chapter III, that the Council had been unable, at its forty-sixth session, to take a decision on the status of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations because of the nature of the Board's activities. Several delegations in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had come to the conclusion that, under the terms of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations did not fulfil the requirements which would qualify it for consultative status. Those delegations had in fact produced irrefutable evidence that the Board's activities not only raised doubts about its status as a non-governmental organization, but were also in conflict with the aims of the United Nations. Although the Co-ordinating Board's representative had stated, in reply to a question asked by one delegation, that in its official memoranda and oral statements, and at NGO meetings, it had never discussed any political issue, that representative had failed to explain the B'nai B'rith statements that Security Council resolution 262 (1968) was a denial of United Nations principles and that Security Council resolu-

tion 265 (1969) represented an act of dishonourable diplomacy which further weakened the United Nations capacity to serve as a genuine peace-making force. B'nai B'rith had also accused the General Assembly of political cynicism and hypocrisy in its election of Syria to the Security Council. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency, whose work in the Middle East was purely humanitarian, had also come in for sharp criticism.

31. The Sudan statement reproduced in document E/4799 cited, with reference to the civil action taken against Rabbi J. Kaufman, Executive Vice-President of B'nai B'rith and Secretary-General of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, a statement by the President of B'nai B'rith to the effect that the primary responsibility was to put through the views as expressed by the Israeli Embassy in Argentina: he asked what activities of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies had undertaken to combat colonialism and *apartheid* in South Africa, where thousands had been deprived of their fundamental freedoms. The South African Jewish Board of Deputies probably did not consider that a primary responsibility. He also wondered what the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, which claimed to be working for the ending of discrimination and the protection of human rights for all peoples, without distinction as to race, colour or religion, was doing to denounce the discrimination to which some Jews and Arabs were being subjected in Israel itself.

32. It thus appeared, that, far from devoting itself to international activities, activities of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations were restricted to the interests of a single group and to the situation in a single State, namely the State of Israel, whose designs it was assisting according to a clearly established programme. Mr. Eban, speaking in the Administrative Committee of the Jewish organization, B'nai B'rith, had stated that the meeting which he was attending was a demonstration of Jewish solidarity towards Israel; Mr. Eban had stressed that that solidarity should not be challenged, but should be proudly proclaimed as a reality and an undeniable fact.

33. His delegation could not in any circumstances endorse the activities of the Co-ordinating Board, as that organization, while claiming to defend human rights, served other interests. It agreed with the view expressed by the representative of Kenya who had said that Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) contained provisions that clearly condemned the attitude of non-governmental organizations which saw fit to criticize United Nations resolutions on political matters.

34. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan) said that the question of the status of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations had already been discussed many times, as was shown by document E/4799. His delegation had always been of the opinion that the Council should not let itself be influenced by the fact that it was dealing with Jewish organizations but that it should apply to them the criteria provided for under Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), the main one being that they should be non-governmental in character.

35. B'nai B'rith, the principal constituent element of the Co-ordinating Board, was acting exclusively as an agent of

the Israeli Government, identifying the welfare of the Jewish people with the present policies of the State of Israel, without taking the rest of mankind into account. According to the Israeli Government Yearbook of 1952, Mr. Ben Gurion had apparently stated that Israel should behave as every other State since its power outside its frontiers was limited and it was just there that the Zionist organizations could do what the State was not able to do. The Co-ordinating Board had answered in the negative when it had been asked if it was subsidizing a political organization seeking to promote the national interests of any State. In that regard, the Kuwait and Sudan representatives had brought to the attention of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations a letter sent by Mrs. Kelly, President of B'nai B'rith Bombay Women's Auxiliary, to Rabbi Kaufman, Secretary-General of the Co-ordinating Board, describing the objective of her organization, which was to persuade the Government of India to establish diplomatic relations with Israel, for which it had received \$3,000 from B'nai B'rith.

36. Pakistan and Sudan had asked various questions, which are contained in document E/4799 and which had not been answered satisfactorily; they could have asked another question concerning the Board's relation with the Jewish Defence League. That activist organization had stated that it considered it legitimate to take reprisal measures against the representatives of the Arab countries to the United Nations every time that acts of violence were committed against Israeli citizens of Palestine.

37. For all those reasons, he felt that the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations should not be granted consultative status. He proposed formally that the Council should decide, by a roll-call vote, to defer its decision on that question.

Mr. Franzi (Italy), Vice-President, took the Chair.

38. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) wished to point out that the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations co-ordinated the activities of three organizations which reflected the opinion of vast sectors of mankind and which existed in many countries of Europe, America and Asia. It therefore had a twofold function of representation, on the one hand, and the promotion of human rights, on the other. B'nai B'rith had tried to broaden the mutual understanding of peoples, had combated extremists, defended the human rights of Jews and of all minorities, and had fought against religious and racial discrimination, as the other organizations co-ordinated by the Board had done. They had contributed to the elaboration of fundamental conventions of international life concerning civil and political rights and had then tried to persuade Governments to ratify them, as well as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Numerous memoranda, press articles, books and films proved that beyond a doubt.

39. The Board was in no way linked to the interests of a particular State since it was financed by the contributions of its affiliates. The comments that could be made concerning some of its constituent organizations could not erase all the work which that organization had done in the field of human rights and which was closely linked with the activities of the United Nations and such organizations as UNICEF and UNESCO.

40. Therefore, he thought that the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations should be placed in category II. The non-governmental organizations were seeking to channel the many currents of world public opinion and to gain recognition for them. For that reason, the number of those organizations should be increased and not limited. In so far as they were non-governmental in character and conformed to the principles of the United Nations, they played an indispensable role in helping the United Nations to interpret world public opinion faithfully, so as to be able to speak truly on behalf of the peoples of the United Nations according to the words used in the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Maramis (Indonesia) resumed the Chair.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking as an Observer, said that it was not for religious reasons that he was opposed to the granting of consultative status to the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations. He recalled that originally B'nai B'rith—one of the three constituent bodies of the Board—was a purely philanthropic movement designed to give assistance to refugees, Jewish and non-Jewish, who were leaving Europe. However, it was regrettable that, since the Dreyfus case, that organization had gradually become politicized, advocating in particular the establishment of a "Jewish National Homeland" in Palestine. In support of that statement, he quoted an article entitled "The World of B'nai B'rith", which had appeared in the *National Jewish Monthly* of January 1968. According to the article, that organization's programme was designed to encourage *aliyah* in all its forms and to facilitate the immigration to Palestine of Jews who wished to move there, even on a temporary basis. Such action, whose political nature could not be denied, did great harm to the indigenous population of Palestine, which had been forced to move out because of the massive arrival of foreigners who had been converted to Judaism but whose ethnic origin was not at all Semite.

42. To show B'nai B'rith's influence on United States policies, he quoted passages from the book *If I Forget Thee Oh Jerusalem: the dramatic story of how American Jews and the United States helped to create Israel* by Robert Silverberg. The book showed how, because of Zionist pressure, the indigenous population of Palestine, which made up at that time, despite heavy immigration from central Europe, two thirds of the inhabitants of that country, had been denied the right to self-determination in 1947. That book also quoted a message from President Nixon stating that the United States was prepared to provide the necessary military equipment to support the efforts of friendly Governments, such as Israel, to defend their people. He felt that that text, addressed to B'nai B'rith, showed the Zionists' role in the White House and their influence on United States policies.

43. B'nai B'rith was encouraging the Israeli expansionists and their desire for exclusive rights to the area. Although the Arabs made up 97 per cent of the world's Semites, a group of Khazars was trying to dominate their part of the world and eliminate the Arabs or exploit them if they could not eliminate them. In support of that assertion, he referred to *The Jewish Mystique*, a book written by Ernest Van Den Haag, in which the author wrote that the Jewish God was

both universal and tribal: He had chosen the Jewish people and in exchange had bound them to worship Him exclusively. Thus, the book continued, the Jews had invented both monotheism and religious intolerance; they had suffered from their own invention ever since but had never given it up for it was after all what made the Jews Jewish.

44. He urged the Council to understand that it would be premature to grant the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations consultative status before examining the activities of B'nai B'rith as carefully as possible.

45. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) thought that the best way to deal with the question of deciding what status to accord non-governmental organizations was to follow the recommendations made by the Council Committee which had been established specifically to consider that question. It was not proper to pass any judgement on those organizations' political views; the Council should concentrate on economic and social considerations, and leave political matters to the competent United Nations bodies. Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the United Nations should be accessible to all political traditions and should attach very high importance to non-governmental organizations, since the United Nations Charter began with the words "We the peoples of the United Nations" instead of stressing Governments, as the Covenant of the League of Nations had done.

46. There were two essential criteria to be taken into consideration in the granting of consultative status to such an organization: it must be clearly non-governmental and its activities must be related to the Council's work. In particular, it should be noted that the constitution of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations had been drawn up long before the State of Israel had been created; the Board did not, therefore, represent the Government of that State. It was important to recognize persons who spoke on their own behalf and not on behalf of the organization in question, and to avoid making judgements based on the personal remarks of a disgruntled employee, as had just been done. He himself had every reason to be satisfied with the replies given by the Co-ordinating Board, whose objectives coincided with the principles laid down in the Charter. That organization was particularly concerned with threats to human rights of Jews; it would indeed be odd if it had not been affected by the annihilation of half of its people. Moreover, as the Uruguayan representative had noted, it had contributed to the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and had communicated some 75 times with subsidiary bodies in regard to matters ranging in subject from racial and religious discrimination to the rights of the child, the right of asylum, and so on.

47. The Council, in order to encourage that organization to continue its work in the promotion of human rights, should therefore grant to the Co-ordinating Board the consultative status which it had enjoyed for 22 years.

48. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) noted that his country's position had been adequately summarized in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations; he would therefore limit his remarks to supporting the proposal formally made by the Sudanese representative.

The Council should defer its decision on the granting of consultative status to the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations until its members had reached some agreement.

49. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, at the Council's previous session, although most of its members had expressed their views concerning what consultative status should be granted to the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, it had been unable to arrive at a decision. During the debate, a considerable number of facts had been mentioned which showed that the Co-ordinating Board did not warrant such status. The Co-ordinating Board had left unanswered many of the questions which had been put to it. For example, it would be useful to have information on the activities of its members in South Africa. One of those members was even a member of the South African Parliament, whose attitude on *apartheid* was well known. There were those who had suggested that the question should not be looked at from the political standpoint, but paragraph 17 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) clearly stated that the organizations should have a general international concern with human rights not restricted to the interests of a particular group of persons, a single nationality or of a situation in a single State. It was clear, however, from current discussions that that organization had ties with a Government of expansionist tendencies. Its activities, moreover, corresponded to paragraphs 36 (a) and (b) of the same resolution. He therefore supported the Sudanese representative's proposal to postpone taking a decision on such a complex question, which warranted a more thorough study.

50. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had already stated its position on three occasions with regard to the question of the granting of consultative status to the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations; there had been no further facts which would induce it to change that position. The Co-ordinating Board fulfilled none of the conditions described in resolution 1296 (XLIV), and in paragraph 17 in particular. Its sole purpose was to protect the rights of Jews throughout the world, and for a number of years it had been doing everything in its power to provide money and support for a certain State. Neither the Co-ordinating Board nor its constituent organization in South Africa was combating colonialism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination or the violation of trade union rights in South Africa. The Board had clearly abused its consultative status by levelling unwarranted and offensive criticism at the Member States of the United Nations. For that reason,

he supported the Sudanese representative's proposal to postpone a decision on that matter to a later date.

At the request of the Sudanese representative a vote was taken by roll-call on that representative's proposal.

Japan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Ceylon, India, Indonesia.

Against: Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, France, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy.

Abstaining: Japan, Kenya, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Chad, Jamaica.

The proposal of the Sudanese representative was rejected, 10 votes being cast in favour and 10 against, with 7 abstentions.

51. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), supported by Mr. FAKH-REDDINE (Sudan), proposed that, since the votes had been equally divided, the final decision should be postponed until the following day's meeting, so as to enable members of the Council to hold informal consultations.

52. The PRESIDENT recalled that, under rule 50 of the Council's rules of procedure, in addition to the proposer of a motion, one representative might speak in favour of and one against the motion.

53. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that, while he recognized that the decision was difficult, he saw no reason for postponing until the following day the vote on the proposal of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. Delegations which had abstained in the roll-call vote might in fact have a definite opinion on the latter proposal. He therefore requested that a vote be taken that same evening.

54. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Pakistan representative's motion.

The motion was adopted by 10 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11.25 p.m.