



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-sixth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 2 June 1969,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 17:</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Non-governmental organizations (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Applications and re-applications for consultative status;</i>	
<i>(b) Review of non-governmental organizations in consultative status</i>	<i>1</i>

President: Mr. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 17

- Non-governmental organizations (continued) (E/4647, E/4671, E/4685 and Add.1, E/L.1251):
- (a) Applications and re-applications for consultative status;
 - (b) Review of non-governmental organizations in consultative status

Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (continued)

1. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan), supported by Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan), asked for an explanation of the United States motion, which had been adopted at the previous meeting. In particular, he wished to know to which consultative category the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations would be assigned.

2. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his motion had been made in support of the second interpretation given by the President of the decision taken by the Council to postpone a final decision regarding the status of the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations. The Board would continue to enjoy consultative status comparable to category B under Council resolution 288 B (X) of 27 February 1950. Clearly, the Board could not be assigned status in any of the new categories because the Council had been unable to take a final decision on that matter; on the other hand, it was equally clear that it should not be deprived of the consultative status it already enjoyed pending such a decision. His motion had therefore mentioned no category but had merely said that the organization would continue to enjoy rights and obligations similar to those it had previously enjoyed, i.e., the rights and obligations of organizations in category B.

3. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the United States representative's interpretation of the Council's decision represented only his own views. An adopted decision must be interpreted by the Council itself. To ask the sponsor of a proposal to interpret it after its adoption was an innovation in United Nations jurisprudence which would make it possible to reopen any decision taken by any United Nations organ.

4. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) observed that the United States motion was itself an interpretation of a previous decision by the Council. The Council must now interpret the decision it had adopted because it was ambiguous and because it created an anomalous situation inasmuch as category B no longer existed.

5. The PRESIDENT said that the issue had been thoroughly discussed and had been closed by a decision taken by vote. Requests for clarification of the United States motion should have been made before the motion had been put to the vote.

The International League for the Rights of Man (continued)

6. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had proposed that the International League for the Rights of Man should be given no consultative status (1582nd meeting). Its officers were persons who had fled or been expelled from their native lands and had found refuge in the United States. From that vantage point, they were levelling false accusations against their former homelands. The League flagrantly violated the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) of 23 May 1968 by making slanderous attacks on many States Members of the United Nations, including Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cuba, Guinea, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Poland, Syria, Trukey, the United Arab Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, although it had no members in those countries. On the other hand, it did not attack such countries as South Africa, South Viet-Nam and Southern Rhodesia, where human rights were being trampled upon, as the United Nations had stated in many resolutions. It also had members in South Africa who supported the policy of apartheid. Its slanderous allegations were made on the basis of propaganda emanating from the United States which the organization itself recognized as untrustworthy, not objective and not founded on first-hand evidence. It defended such traitors to their countries as the notorious Moise Tshombé. Since a non-governmental organization consisting of a constellation of traitors expelled from their own countries who had formed a league to slander their former homelands could only discredit the very idea of consultative status, the International League for the Rights of Man was not entitled to such status.

7. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that in the long debates on the League held in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the argument put forward by the Soviet representative had been applied to all non-governmental organizations which were defending human rights and which included political refugees among their officers. But surely it was only natural that persons who had been persecuted in their own countries should denounce such violations of human

rights when they found refuge in other countries. Refugees were not to be scorned; his country gave asylum to refugees from all countries. In any event, what was important was not the character of the persons involved but the nature of the violations.

8. It was true, as the Soviet representative had said, that the League had no representatives in the countries to which he had referred. However, it had 750,000 members in twenty-nine affiliated organizations in Africa, Canada, Germany, Honduras, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, Pakistan, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States. It was logical that it should have fewer members in countries where the atmosphere of freedom did not exist.

9. He was personally acquainted with many of the members of the League, including the present President of Venezuela; the former President of Costa Rica; Germán Arciniegas, a distinguished Colombian literary figure; Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, the outstanding leader of the Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana movement in Peru; and the great Spanish writer Salvador de Madariaga, who was now living in London because he was unable to exercise independent thought under the political régime in his own country. Those distinguished men were a guarantee of the organization's integrity. The League would be incapable of flouting the principles of the United Nations or engaging in dishonourable activities. It was only just to place the International League for the Rights of Man in category II.

10. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, in view of the sharp attack on the League by the Soviet representative, he wished to say that the League had become a byword in progressive circles for having fearlessly defended human rights whenever and wherever they were jeopardized. The League had been established in France in 1943 in revulsion against the atrocities and flagrant violations of human rights committed by the Nazis during the Second World War. One of its officers was Henri Laugier, one of the first Under-Secretaries-General of the United Nations Secretariat in charge of the former Department of Social Affairs, including the Human Rights Division. Its members included Roger Baldwin, a great fighter for human rights in the United States who, on his eighty-fifth birthday, had received letters of congratulation and good wishes from such personalities as Julius Nyerere of the United Republic of Tanzania, Indira Gandhi, the Attorney-General of India and Roy Wilkins, of the United States National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

11. The League fought for the human rights of all, the rich, the poor, or the imprisoned. It had protested to the United Nations against the Indonesian massacre of 1965 and the recent trials in Greece; it had supported the revocation by the United Nations of South Africa's mandate over South West Africa, had urged sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and supported the proposal that the Commission on Human Rights should not only receive reports of violations of human rights but should also examine them. Unlike the Soviet representative, who would not tolerate any reference to human rights problems in his country, he was not worried about criticism of aspects of life in the United States; in

fact he welcomed such criticism because it opened the way to improvement. In his view, it was impossible not to grant consultative status to an organization which deserved a place of honour among non-governmental organizations.

12. He found it strange that the Soviet representative had taken exception to granting status to organizations which were interested in human rights, as if he were attempting to prevent them from speaking out against violations. He hoped that the Council, by its vote, would show the non-governmental organizations that they need not fear that silence was the price of consultative status with the Economic and Social Council: on the contrary, they should not be subject to any kind of direct or indirect censorship which would make them afraid of denouncing violations of human rights whenever and wherever they occurred.

13. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Soviet proposal to grant no consultative status to the International League for the Rights of Man.

The proposal was rejected by 13 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) (continued)

14. The PRESIDENT observed that the Soviet Union had proposed that INTERPOL should be given no consultative status (1582nd meeting).

15. Mr. JHA (India) felt that part one of the recommendations on INTERPOL contained in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (see E/4647) conflicted with part three. If the organization was placed in category II, it might be deprived of the possibility of playing a more active role, especially in the field of narcotics control. Whatever arrangements might be made should give the organization greater access to the Council. He therefore proposed the following formulation:

"The Council decided to place the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) in category II for the time being, and request the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to study a special arrangement to be arrived at between the Council and INTERPOL and to report to the Council at its forty-eighth session."

16. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation, hoping to avoid an involved legal discussion as to whether INTERPOL was a non-governmental or an intergovernmental organization, had made a three-part proposal which had been adopted by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The third part of that proposal had envisaged that the Economic and Social Council would study a special arrangement for its consultations with INTERPOL. Since the Indian proposal was in a sense a further elaboration of that idea, his delegation had no difficulty in accepting it. While a special arrangement was being worked out for INTERPOL, the organization would remain in category II.

17. He stressed that it was absolutely necessary to keep INTERPOL in some sort of consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, if necessary, a *sui generis* status. INTERPOL's activities were extremely important and its contribution to the fight

against organized international crime, the slave trade, narcotics traffic, prostitution and smuggling was well known.

18. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Uruguay that INTERPOL was a vitally important organization and must be maintained in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. Its work in the suppression of the growing illicit traffic in narcotics and its close co-operation with the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board were essential to the United Nations. The crux of the argument was the legal status of INTERPOL. In his delegation's view, INTERPOL was not an intergovernmental organization, since it had not been established by intergovernmental agreement.

19. He supported the Indian proposal and wondered whether the representative of India would be willing to add the following amendment to the end of his text: "should it be established that INTERPOL qualifies as an intergovernmental organization".

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) asked the representative of the Soviet Union to withdraw his proposal in favour of the proposal made by the representative of India.

21. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the interest of expediting the Council's work, his delegation would withdraw its proposal in favour of the Indian proposal. He stressed, however, that the United States amendment was unacceptable to his delegation since it would prejudice the future decision of the Council. If India accepted the United States amendment, he would have to maintain his proposal.

22. He wished to make it clear that his delegation could not fully support the Indian proposal because in its view, INTERPOL was legally an intergovernmental organization. Moreover, like many other socialist countries, the Soviet Union had serious objections to the activities of INTERPOL.

23. Mr. JHA (India) expressed his gratitude to the Soviet representative for withdrawing his proposal. The thrust of the Indian proposal was that, whatever the results of its consideration, the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should report to the Council. The United States amendment placed a further restriction on the work of the Council Committee, and he hoped that the United States representative would agree to withdraw his amendment.

24. As to the special arrangement with the Economic and Social Council envisaged for INTERPOL, he pointed out that INTERPOL itself, in a communication to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, had favoured the idea of a special arrangement with the Economic and Social Council. Under such an arrangement, INTERPOL's recommendations would be taken more seriously.

25. Mr. VIAUD (France) felt that INTERPOL was doing very useful work and that it fully deserved a place in category II. However, he was not opposed to a review of the organization's status and had no objection to the Indian proposal.

26. In his view, there was no valid legal argument against placing INTERPOL in category II. It was a

non-governmental organization within the meaning of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), since it had not been established by a formal inter-governmental agreement. As he understood the United States amendment, it called the status of INTERPOL as a non-governmental organization into question, and he felt that the Indian proposal was more satisfactory. His delegation was prepared to endorse the Indian proposal on the understanding that, should the Committee decide that INTERPOL was in fact an intergovernmental organization, it would then refer the matter to another body since the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations under its present terms of reference was not competent to discuss an intergovernmental organization.

27. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that in the light of the statements made by the representatives of India and France, he would withdraw his amendment in the hope that the Council might proceed to a vote without further delay.

28. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a formal vote on the proposal under discussion.

29. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Indian proposal (see para. 15 above).

The Indian proposal was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

International Police Association (continued)

30. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled his delegation's proposal (1582nd) meeting that the International Police Association should be struck from the Roster. It was a very specialized organization which could contribute little to the work of the Economic and Social Council, but the major objection to granting it consultative status was that it maintained an office in Southern Rhodesia, assisting an outlaw Government which was attempting to suppress the struggle for national liberation.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the status of the organization had been debated at length in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and expressed the hope that the members of the Council would not find it necessary to engage in further polemics in that connexion. The Council Committee had recommended that the organization should be granted consultative status and kept on the Roster, since the value of its contribution had not been seriously questioned previously and it had always enjoyed good relations with the United Nations family.

32. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) recalled that the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had inquired as to whether the organization maintained any contact with the Portuguese or South African authorities. The organization had replied that it had no such ties. The Tanzanian representative had also asked why representatives of his country's police forces had not been invited to participate in the meetings of the organization. The organization had countered with the information that invitations had been extended but no replies had been received. There had been no attempt to exclude Tanzanian police officers from the organization's meetings.

33. His delegation would vote in favour of granting consultative status to the organization.

34. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should proceed to a vote on the USSR proposal that the International Police Association should be removed from the Roster.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 19 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

35. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) explained that his delegation had voted for the USSR proposal because in its Rhodesia Boycott Act of 1963, the Sudanese Government had condemned all organizations associated with the illegal Government in Southern Rhodesia. His Government could not agree to grant consultative status to any organization which maintained contacts with Southern Rhodesia.

36. The PRESIDENT invited the Committee to consider the remaining paragraphs of the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/4647).

Paragraph 9

The Committee's recommendation in paragraph 9 was adopted.

Paragraphs 10 and 11

37. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 11, said that, according to Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), there should be some provision for consultation between the Secretary-General and the Committee or Council concerning the organizations which the Secretary-General intended to place on the Roster.

38. The PRESIDENT pointed out that that observation would be more relevant to the discussion of paragraph 13. He inquired whether the Council agreed to take note of paragraphs 10 and 11.

It was so decided.

Paragraphs 12 and 13

39. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to his delegation's reservations, mentioned in paragraph 12 of the report, stating that it was inadmissible that non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the specialized agencies should automatically receive Roster status. In support of his view he quoted paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), particularly the last sentence.

40. The position of the specialized agencies was not the same as that of the Council; the membership varied, and it was essential for the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to be able to scrutinize the organizations concerned.

41. He proposed the following motion:

"The Council requests its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, in accordance with paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), to examine the question of the procedure for granting consultative status to non-governmental organizations which enjoy such status with specialized agencies, and to present its recommendations to its forty-eighth session."

42. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) considered that it would be putting too heavy a burden on the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations if it had to consider 200 or more organizations which had consultative status with the specialized agencies. Paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) clearly showed that there were two groups of non-governmental organizations which were placed on the Roster: those which were placed there by action of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations or the Council or the Secretary-General, and those which were placed there because they had consultative status with a specialized agency or similar body. However, paragraph 12 of the report recommended that the second group should be listed separately. His delegation therefore did not see any need for the Soviet motion and would have to vote against it.

43. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed that he had proposed a procedural motion to enable the Council and the Committee to establish a procedure for determining the status of any organization about whose usefulness the Council might have doubts. It was important to ensure that all organizations were not accepted automatically, but only those which made a useful contribution. Only if an appropriate procedure was established would the Council or the Committee have an opportunity of deciding that point.

44. Mrs. CHITTY (United Kingdom) also felt that the Soviet proposal was not absolutely necessary. Paragraph 11 of resolution 1296 (XLIV) acknowledged the interest of the Economic and Social Council in non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the specialized agencies, and paragraph 19 enabled the Council to include them in its list, or Roster. It would be invidious if the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations were to go through that list and make a decision which the specialized agencies themselves had already made, and it would duplicate the work already done by the agencies. In her view it was sufficient if the organizations in consultative status with the agencies were listed separately on the Roster, as suggested in paragraph 12 of the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

45. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) asked for clarification as to the purpose of the Soviet motion. An exhaustive examination of each non-governmental organization having consultative status with specialized agencies would require many meetings and massive documentation, and would therefore have considerable financial implications.

46. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized once again that his motion only called for a study of procedure. He was against the automatic inclusion on the Roster of a very large number of organizations; it was surely far more expensive to send documentation to all those organizations.

47. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) inquired what the status of organizations would be pending the establishment of procedures and the making of recommendations. He hoped that some organi-

zations would not disappear from the Roster for a year or two. It should be borne in mind that several regional United Nations bodies, such as the economic commissions, had valuable consultative arrangements with non-governmental organizations in under-developed areas.

48. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) felt strongly that the texts of paragraphs 12 and 13 of the report (*ibid.*), together with paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), covered the situation adequately.

49. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) stated that his delegation was opposed to the automatic granting of consultative status to any organization. No financial consideration ought to stand in the way of examining individual organizations in depth and passing judgement on their acceptability.

50. Mr. JHA (India) said that it was his understanding that the Soviet delegation was not asking for a review of all the non-governmental organizations, but wished to ensure that in exceptional cases any delegation represented on the Council or the Committee should be able to request a review of the status of any organization on the Roster. He therefore wished to suggest an alternative motion to that effect, which might more appropriately form a new paragraph 13 than an addition to paragraph 12 of the report.

"The Committee decides that, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 12 of the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/4647), delegates will have the right to call for a detailed discussion on any individual organization placed on the Roster by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 19 of resolution 1296 (XLIV)."

51. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the representative of India for his correct interpretation of the aim of the Soviet proposal. There was no intention of pressing for consideration of 176 organizations having consultative status with the specialized agencies. The aim was to reserve to the Council the right to examine particular cases of a few organizations, if necessary. He felt that the wording proposed by the previous speaker would help to solve the problem and should be added to the report.

52. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation maintained its position, which was to abide by the present text of the report (E/4647). As the representative of Uruguay had stressed, paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) set out the position clearly. He would have to vote against the new motion, partly because he was afraid it might lead to similar time-consuming sessions in future on matters which were not questions of substance, and because it might enable any Government which disapproved of criticism appearing in a pamphlet published by a non-governmental organization, to attempt to remove that organization from the Roster, and to undertake a campaign of intimidation against it.

53. Mr. BABAA (Libya) supported the Indian motion. His delegation believed that the Council was entitled to review the activities of any non-governmental

organization which had consultative status. He could not agree with the United States representative that acceptance of that motion would be prejudicial to the Council's work. On the contrary, the current discussion had been very useful.

54. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) proposed the following amendment to the Indian motion: replace "to call for a detailed discussion on" by "to call for a review of the status of", and omit "by the Secretary-General".

55. Mr. JHA (India), in reply to a request for clarification from the representative of the USSR, said that his motion was intended to cover both types of non-governmental organizations, those having status with the specialized agencies and those placed on the list by the Secretary-General.

56. With regard to the Sudan amendment, he felt it would be confusing not to include a reference to the Secretary-General, but he would have no objection to the phrase "call for a review of the status".

57. Mr. CATES (United States of America) stressed that paragraph 19 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) was mainly concerned with the organizations in consultative status with the specialized agencies, which it was not the task of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to examine. He felt that there was some confusion in the discussion between the substance of that paragraph, and paragraphs 12 and 13 of the Committee's report (E/4647), and the note by the Secretary-General (E/4671). The main point was the need to separate the two types of organizations on the Roster. He proposed that paragraphs 12 and 13 of the report be adopted, on the understanding that the summary record of the discussion would be available to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

58. Mr. JHA (India) agreed that there had been some confusion in the discussion. One basic concern was the need to avoid the possibility that organizations might try to get in through the "back door" through a specialized agency such as the International Labour Organisation. It was not a healthy situation if delegations were unable to comment on the placing of individual organizations on the Roster. He wished to maintain his proposal.

59. The PRESIDENT proposed that paragraphs 12 and 13 should be left in abeyance until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 14

60. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Council that his delegation had submitted a proposal in that context, which appeared in annex III to the report (E/4647). In its place, he now proposed the following text:

"The Council, in accordance with paragraph 4 of its resolution 1296 (XLIV), requests the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to consider the question of the grouping together of non-governmental organizations with similar objectives, interests and basic views, in a given field,

and to submit concrete recommendations to its forty-eighth session."

61. Mr. CATES (United States of America), observing that his delegation could not accept that proposal without further discussion, proposed that consideration of paragraph 14 should also be deferred until the following meeting.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should defer a decision on paragraphs 12 and 13 and further discussion of the remaining paragraphs until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.