

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1715th
MEETING

Wednesday, 26 November 1969,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 59 and 60:	
International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	
Implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	377
General debate (<i>concluded</i>)	
Consideration of draft resolutions	382

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

AGENDA ITEMS 59 AND 60

International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7666 and Add.1)

Implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7661)

GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

1. Mr. OSHODI (Nigeria) observed that the aim of the International Year for Human Rights had been to assess achievements throughout the world in the field of human rights and to determine what remained to be done. The International Conference on Human Rights held at Teheran, in which his delegation had taken an active part, had adopted a Proclamation¹ which could now be used as a yardstick to measure progress achieved in the field of human rights and on which the various resolutions adopted at Teheran had been based. The Proclamation stated that, despite the adoption of many international instruments, much remained to be done in regard to the implementation of human rights and fundamental freedoms and that that aim, which was the primary aim of the United Nations, could not be realized unless the laws of every country granted to each individual, irrespective of race, language, religion or political belief, freedom of expression, of information, of conscience and of religion, as well as the right to participate in the political, economic, cultural and social life of his country.

2. The Nigerian Constitution not only guaranteed the enjoyment of the fundamental human rights of all Nigerian citizens but also accorded to any injured party the right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial

tribunal. The Conference on Human Rights had adopted resolutions on *apartheid*, colonialism, aggression and armed conflict, discrimination, the gap between developed and developing countries, and illiteracy. To attain the desired objectives it was not enough to adopt resolutions; the world's moral conscience must be awakened to the evils which the United Nations was striving to overcome.

3. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay), referring to the statement made by the Israeli representative on the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union, observed that freedom of movement was one of the human rights protected by the international juridical order instituted by the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments. Such freedom of movement, which comprised the right of entry into and departure from all countries and the right of emigration and return, could be restricted only by virtue of a penal sentence. Those principles were applicable to the situation described by the Israeli representative, but proof of the alleged acts would be required.

4. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi) observed that the Secretary-General had noted in his report on measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights (A/7666 and Add.1) that the information he had received indicated a positive and encouraging response to the General Assembly's resolutions calling for intensified efforts and undertakings in the field of human rights. However, the Israeli representative had charged the USSR with denying certain fundamental rights to its Jewish nationals, which seemed to indicate that progress towards complete respect for human rights was being seriously impeded in an important area of the world. Since the Jews living outside Israel constituted a traditional minority group in many countries, the treatment of that group was a legitimate topic of debate in the Third Committee.

5. It had been said that discussion of that topic was exacerbating the cold war, that Israel was trying to use it to divert attention from its own violations of human rights in occupied Arab territories, that that country had no right to speak for world Jewry and that discussion of the question would be tantamount to interference by the United Nations in a country's internal affairs. In his delegation's view, none of those arguments was valid. The cold war had been mentioned only because the Soviet Union happened to be one of the world's two super-Powers and because the other had supported Israel, but Israel could have shown the same concern about the fate of Jews in other countries, as, indeed, it had. It could not be claimed that the concern which had thus been shown about the Jewish minority in the USSR was groundless until the issue, which was essentially humanitarian rather than political, had been considered. The fact that the United States had supported

¹ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 3.

Israel in the discussion should not be interpreted as evidence of a cold war attitude. It was only natural for Jews in the United States to be concerned about the fate of Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union. That was not the first occasion on which the attention of the General Assembly or one of its Committees had been drawn to a particular violation of human rights so as to encourage the formation of a world pressure group, but it was not often that political considerations were cited as the motive underlying that procedure. It could not be claimed that Israel was trying to divert attention from the situation in the occupied territories, for the Assembly had already studied the question, and, in any case, confirmation of the charges against Israel would not invalidate Israel's charges against the Soviet Union.

6. With regard to the question whether the United Nations would be interfering in the internal affairs of the USSR, that was the dilemma in which it always found itself in cases of violations of human rights because the United Nations Charter upheld the concept of national sovereignty while at the same time adjuring Member States to take all possible steps to ensure respect for fundamental human rights throughout the international community. It was customary practice to recognize the legitimacy of discussing the question, as indicated by the existence of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

7. He had made those remarks out of concern for justice. They were concerned not with the substance of the charges brought by Israel against the Soviet Union but with the arguments used to prevent discussion and divert the Committee's attention from those charges. It was for Israel and other countries with substantial Jewish populations to speak on the substance of the question. If Israel's charges were true, they were a matter for concern. The Soviet Union's reply could not entirely have reassured either Israel or its friends, and he therefore hoped that the USSR, in conformity with the principles established by Lenin himself, would heed Israel's appeal on behalf of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

8. The CHAIRMAN appealed to delegations to restrict their observations to the document under consideration and avoid any political discussion.

9. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of Malawi that it was unreasonable to require certain Governments and not others to answer for violations of human rights in their territory. Under Article 56 of the Charter, to which all States Members had acceded, respect for human rights was a matter of international obligation. It was thus perfectly proper to discuss the situation of religious minorities. He reminded the Committee of paragraph 52 of the Proclamation of Teheran; in accordance with which freedom of expression, of information, of conscience and of religion should be guaranteed by legislation. His delegation had made known its position in that connexion at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, and that position remained unchanged. However, if the question of religious minorities was to be discussed, the debate should not be limited to a single minority.

10. Miss DOBSON (Australia) recalled that her delegation had already had occasion to describe the many activities which the Australian Government and various private organizations had undertaken during the International Year for Human Rights: seminars and conferences, the distribution of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other United Nations documents on human rights, and the publicity given to the International Year through the information media and the publication of newsletters.

11. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 2441 (XXIII), Australia was prolonging those activities after 1968: a Working Conference on Human Rights, organized with the financial assistance of the Government, had adopted many recommendations. Because of its own traditions, the existence of an independent judiciary and an economic and social climate which favoured tolerance, respect for human rights was inherent in the way of life of Australians. For Australia, therefore, the International Year for Human Rights had been essentially an occasion for heightening awareness of international standards relating to human rights. The celebration of that Year and the International Conference at Teheran had also drawn attention to violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms which persisted despite all the instruments adopted by the United Nations. The number of refugees with which the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Commissioner General of UNRWA were concerned had increased in Europe, Africa and the Middle East. In addition, according to some reports, racial and religious minorities were victims of discrimination. Many of the resolutions of the International Conference on Human Rights were based on the principle that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights represented ethics common to all members of the international community. Article 18 of the Universal Declaration set forth the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Although that Declaration had been proclaimed twenty-one years earlier, religious intolerance still existed and her delegation thought that those countries which sincerely desired to practise religious liberty should have time to put an end to such intolerance. The Jewish people, in particular, had been and still were victims of religious intolerance. If Governments could not eliminate anti-Semitic prejudices, they should at least permit Jews to emigrate if they so wished.

12. Her delegation hoped that the tolerance and mutual respect which had been proclaimed during the International Year for Human Rights and at the Teheran Conference would become a reality.

13. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) observed that the Secretary-General had noted in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization that events during the International Year for Human Rights had brought out more clearly than ever before the contrast between signs of cruel disregard for human rights in a number of places and mankind's increasingly noticeable concern for rapid achievements in that field.³ Member States had met at Teheran to undertake the obligation to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. The efforts of his Government in that respect had been

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 133.

sustained and systematic and formed the basis of an over-all plan for economic revolution aimed at ensuring the maximum of freedom and dignity for all Syrians. The progress which had been achieved was in part outlined in the report on the implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights (A/7661). A Provisional Constitution had been proclaimed on 15 May 1969 which guaranteed to each individual the maximum of freedom and dignity and the right to participate in the political, economic, cultural and social life of the country. That Constitution was based on the principle that human rights and fundamental freedoms were indivisible and that the full attainment of civil and political rights would be impossible without the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, and that, consequently, the implementation of human rights depended on effective economic and social development policies. Syrian democracy guaranteed the elimination of all forms of exploitation and bestowed upon the productive sectors of society the right to determine their social, economic and cultural development. Many legislative measures had been adopted. Although Syria was the victim of foreign aggression and its territory was partly occupied, it recognized the universality of human rights. On 21 April 1969, it had acceded to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as well as to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. As a member of the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it had constantly defended the right to self-determination of colonial peoples and supported national liberation movements.

14. His Government had celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was engaged in implementing the resolutions adopted at the International Conference on Human Rights. Syria's policy had, moreover, always been in conformity with the principles set out in those instruments and the Government would pursue the struggle at all levels to eliminate any situation which might be prejudicial to human rights.

15. In conclusion, his delegation welcomed the fact that at the previous meeting the Director of the Division of Human Rights had announced that paragraph 5 resolution I⁴ of the Teheran Conference relating to an investigation into violations of human rights in the territories occupied by Israel would shortly be implemented in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII). He thought, however, that the Special Committee responsible for carrying out the investigation should have at its disposal an interim report on the development of the situation since the adoption of the Teheran resolution. He hoped that that Committee would shortly be able to start the investigation which it had been asked to carry out and would report to the Secretary-General without delay.

16. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her Government's replies concerning measures and activities undertaken in

connexion with the International Year for Human Rights and the implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights appeared in documents A/7666 and Add.1 and A/7661. One year was too short a period of time to evaluate the results of the International Conference on Human Rights; the adoption of legislation and the education of public opinion were two processes which required a certain amount of time and continuous effort and it was difficult to describe exactly the measures taken to implement the twenty-nine resolutions of the Teheran Conference. Furthermore, document A/7661 should be considered in the light of the replies of Governments regarding measures taken in implementation of other resolutions of the General Assembly or other competent United Nations organs. In that connexion, her Government had noted with particular interest the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation at the forty-sixth session of the Economic and Social Council aimed at reducing the number of requests addressed to Member States for information in the field of human rights;⁵ the Economic and Social Council had decided to forward the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and that Committee had asked the Commission on Human Rights to consider the question. The more time the ministries concerned were obliged to spend preparing reports for the United Nations, the less time they would have to take constructive and useful measures. She hoped, therefore, that the Commission on Human Rights would consider the question at its twenty-sixth session and she was glad to note that the draft resolution submitted in document A/C.3/L.1743 contained no new requests for information.

17. Despite the limited scope of document A/7661, it was clear that the Teheran Conference had had positive results in the form both of measures taken at the national level and of measures taken by the United Nations family of organizations and by regional intergovernmental organizations. In that connexion, she noted that the competent organs of the Council of Europe were paying increasing attention to United Nations activities relating to human rights. As far as the International Year for Human Rights was concerned, her delegation thought that document A/7666 and Add.1 provided a positive evaluation. However, there was still much to be done. Her delegation attached great importance to measures aimed at ensuring changes of attitude, at reaching young people in particular and at increasing contacts between people living in different conditions. The programme of advisory services in the field of human rights was very useful in that respect, but it was too limited considering the magnitude and complexity of the problems involved. Her delegation thought that it would be better to adopt fewer resolutions and take more positive action.

18. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia) agreed with the Saudi Arabian representative that it was regrettable that the members who were most responsible for the future of civilization and who should set an example of at least a minimum of harmony, forgetting their social, humanitarian and cultural aims, had stirred up old rivalries and revived

⁴ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 5.

⁵ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 11 and 13, document E/4693, paras. 19-21.

international tension in connexion with the troubles prevailing in certain parts of the world. He particularly regretted the resumption of the cold war in the form of a hostile exchange of views in the Committee between the Soviet and United States delegations on the question of violations of human rights. Those two great Powers, which held in their hands the destiny of mankind, should join together, instead of fighting, in order to bring about the triumph of the cause of human rights and ensure peace and security among all nations. Never before had there been so much talk about dignity and understanding among men, yet never had those two concepts been so flagrantly disregarded. The weapons of death were proliferating and, by an absurd paradox, peace was being maintained thanks to the great Powers' fear of each other. Yet despite the gravity of the situation, he hoped that the United Nations would succeed in its task and achieve its lofty purposes. Colombia was ready to take part in the fight against racial discrimination. He wished to make it clear in that connexion that his country was by tradition free from racial discrimination, as shown by the Congress held in 1969 at Bogotá to examine such matters as the complaints relating to the condition of Jews in the Soviet Union. It would continue to contribute, by all the means in its power, to the implementation of the programme for the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

19. Mr. BRADY (New Zealand) said that his delegation had been among the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 2441 (XXIII), which *inter alia* invited Member States, United Nations organs, specialized agencies, regional inter-governmental organizations and national and international organizations concerned to continue to supply as much relevant information as possible to the Secretary-General to enable him to prepare a final report on the International Year for Human Rights to be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. That report was contained in document A/7666 and Add.1 and supplemented the progress reports submitted to the twenty-second⁶ and twenty-third⁷ sessions of the General Assembly. Those documents bore witness to the earnest efforts made by a large number of States and organizations to respond to the appeal made by the Assembly on the occasion of the International Year for Human Rights.

20. Official activities undertaken in New Zealand during the Year had included seminars, public lectures and radio and television broadcasts aimed at interesting New Zealanders in human rights questions both at home and abroad. In addition, a number of non-governmental organizations had held meetings on the subject of human rights, culminating in a conference organized with financial assistance from the Government which had discussed a wide range of subjects, such as race relations, women's rights and international agreements in the field of human rights in that connexion. He said that his Government had signed or ratified several international instruments in the field of human rights during the International Year, including the International Covenants on Human Rights, which had been signed on 12 November 1968. His Government had also begun the procedure for ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. His

delegation wished to pay a tribute to those other Governments and organizations which, as the Secretary-General's reports showed, had actively participated in the celebration of the International Year. He also mentioned the activities of the United Nations, including the publication by the Secretary-General of an information bulletin on a continuing basis in accordance with resolution 2441 (XXIII).

21. His delegation would like to commend the Secretary-General for his excellent report concerning implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights (A/7661). The report was of great interest not only as a record of the efforts made by Member States to give effect to the recommendations of the Conference, but also as a reminder of the wide disparity of the concerns and requirements of the different members of the international community in the field of human rights. Although the recommendations had been disappointing in some respects, the Teheran Conference had broken new ground in a number of fields, as witness its proposals concerning human rights in armed conflicts, the rights of detained persons, and human rights aspects of family planning. But the question of the implementation of standards in the human rights field was still, in his delegation's view, one of the primary responsibilities with which the international community would have to concern itself in the years immediately ahead and it was to be regretted that the Teheran Conference had not come to grips with that problem. In recent years his delegation had supported, in the Commission on Human Rights and in other United Nations bodies, the adoption of more effective measures to safeguard human rights and ensure the implementation of the standards already drawn up and accepted by the international community. The General Assembly had achieved some progress in that field with the establishment of various kinds of supervisory machinery in the International Covenants on Human Rights and in the Individual Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. His delegation also noted with satisfaction the adoption by the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies of new procedures for the handling of human rights complaints. It regretted, however, that the Committee had been obliged to spend so much of its time listening to allegations of violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in countries which had been the theatre of armed conflict or which had ethnic or religious minorities, without the benefit of impartial investigation of such allegations or the assurance that any violations of human rights which were found to exist would be brought to an end. Although the Teheran Conference had not addressed itself specifically to the issue of the universal implementation of established human rights standards, resolution XVII⁸ of the Conference stressed the correlation which existed in many parts of the world between economic and social development and progress in the field of human rights. His delegation felt that that was another area which required further study, and that such efforts as the preparation of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development would perhaps come to be regarded as one of the Committee's most important contributions to the progress achieved in the field of human rights. His delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1743.

⁶ Document A/6866 and Add.1 and 2 (mimeographed).

⁷ Document A/7195 and Add.1 and Add.3-9 (mimeographed).

⁸ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 14.

22. Mr. JOHNSON (Jamaica) recalled that, within the framework of the International Year for Human Rights, the Teheran Conference had been assigned a threefold objective: to examine the progress which had been made at the international level over the past twenty years, to evaluate that progress and to determine the future course of United Nations activities in the human rights field. It was also hoped that a parallel process would take place at the national level in each Member State: that Governments and peoples would take the opportunity to examine their situations, to measure them against internationally recognized standards and to determine what measures could best be taken, in their particular circumstances, to guarantee more effectively the dignity of the human person. Finally, it was hoped that those activities, national and international, would stimulate States to strengthen the existing international machinery by participation in human rights conventions, by wider use of the reporting system, by greater use of available resources under the programme of advisory services or by showing greater readiness to comply with the resolutions and recommendations of the United Nations. The reports submitted by the Secretary-General provided some useful indications concerning the areas where efforts by the international community had achieved results. His delegation considered that those successes justified some degree of optimism. A considerable number of Member States had responded to the General Assembly's appeal, and the reports indicated that a whole series of modest but encouraging steps had been taken at the national level.

23. In at least one area, that of international conventions in the field of human rights, the International Year had borne fruit. Since the adoption of resolution 1961 (XVIII), designating 1968 as International Year for Human Rights, the General Assembly had adopted the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the first international instrument to contain comprehensive machinery for implementation, the two International Covenants on Human Rights and the Optional Protocol. The Teheran Conference had made it apparent that there were new areas in which additional humanitarian legislation would have to be enacted—i.e., certain aspects of armed conflict and certain questions raised by rapid scientific and technological advance—and the study which must precede such legislation had already begun. Thus the innovative role of the United Nations in human rights legislation was clear.

24. An equally important aspect of the question, that of consolidating the legislation in question, had, however, been neglected. For example, a large number of older human rights conventions, which were now widely adhered to, either contained no implementation measures at all or provided only for measures concerning a reporting obligation, which few States Parties took seriously. His delegation hoped that, in the light of the experience soon to be gained in connexion with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, consideration might be given to the adoption of common implementation measures for a number of conventions which were similar in scope. In addition, Member States were in general agreement in recognizing that certain areas, such as religious intolerance and freedom of information, should be covered by conventions, but they were unable to agree on the nature and

scope of the desired instrument. His delegation felt that rather than holding such questions over from one session to another, the Committee should examine the premises on which the earlier work had been based in order to decide whether it was still relevant or whether entirely different conventions might better answer existing needs. Finally, he drew the attention of members of the Committee to the question of assistance to States in connexion with the procedure for adhering to human rights conventions. UNITAR had prepared for the Teheran Conference an extremely interesting study⁹ stressing the difficulty encountered by some States, particularly new ones, in working out appropriate procedures for the ratification of conventions and suggesting several ways of assisting States in that connexion. A draft resolution based on that study had in fact been submitted at Teheran,¹⁰ but it had not been possible to consider it, owing to lack of time. His delegation considered that that proposal should be revived.

25. Turning to proposals concerning new procedures to be adopted in the human rights field, he emphasized the apparent contradiction between Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations and Articles 55 and 56. The United Nations had taken an increasingly flexible attitude regarding the question of which of those principles should override the other, and in what circumstances, and it was apparent from the Committee's debates at its current session that that flexibility would be extended to an increasing number of situations. It was still too early to say whether that tendency was constructive or destructive. However, it was certain that, so long as the General Assembly had established no impartial procedure based on the Charter, it would remain entrapped in mutual accusations and sterile recriminations. At the twenty-third session his delegation had been a sponsor of a resolution in which the General Assembly had decided to give attention to the resolutions of the Conference within the context of the consideration of corresponding items of its agenda. That decision should not serve as a pretext for an annual exchange of acrimonious accusations, but should provide the Committee with an opportunity to consider initiatives taken in the human rights field within the framework of the principles established at Teheran. The United Nations should not give the world the impression that in 1968 it had discharged once and for all its responsibilities regarding the protection of human rights. For that reason his delegation noted with satisfaction that resolution 2499 A (XXIV), adopted by the General Assembly on 31 October 1969 in connexion with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, proposed a plan of action in the human rights field and that the fundamental objectives of the International Year for Human Rights had been incorporated into the broader framework of the anniversary of the United Nations.

26. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), referring to some comments made by the representative of Syria, said that resolution I of the International Conference on Human Rights on respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories had been

⁹ Document A/CONF. 32/15 (mimeographed).

¹⁰ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), draft resolution C, p. 48.

reflected in General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII) concerning the establishment of a Special Committee composed of three Member States to investigate Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. The Secretary-General had announced¹¹ that the representatives of Ceylon, Somalia and Yugoslavia had been chosen by the representative of Peru under the agreed procedure to serve on that Committee. The Committee had already begun to prepare its programme of work; it had taken steps concerning the implementation of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, but it had not yet reported to the Secretary-General. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII), the Secretary-General was prepared to provide the Committee with the assistance which it would need to accomplish its task, and he would submit to the Fifth Committee a request for an allocation for that purpose.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

27. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.1743 on behalf of its sponsors, which now included Iran and France said that he was pleased at the success of the International Year for Human Rights. However, the results achieved would not be lasting unless the measures and activities undertaken on the occasion of the International Year by Governments, United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, regional intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations were continued, developed and broadened. He noted several corrections which the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided to make in the text; in the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "that various measures had been taken and progress has been achieved" should be replaced by "the measures that have been taken and the progress that has been achieved". In operative paragraph 1, the words "for their contributions" should be replaced by "which have contributed". The third correction, affecting operative paragraph 3, consisted of inserting the words "genuinely concerned with human rights" after the words "non-governmental organizations".

28. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) requested that the name of her delegation should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

29. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said that she supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1743 but wondered why the sponsors thought it proper to speak of non-governmental organizations "genuinely concerned" in operative paragraph 3, while operative paragraphs 1 and 4 spoke only of organizations concerned. It was quite clear that all the organizations concerned were in fact "genuinely" concerned.

30. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said he did not see why the United States representative should object to an express mention of "genuinely concerned" non-governmental organizations.

31. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said the addition of the word "genuinely" suggested that some of the non-governmental organizations were pretending to be concerned with human rights.

32. Mr. JHA (India) explained that the sponsors' intention had been to take account of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), concerning arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations, and in particular part VIII of that resolution, on the suspension and withdrawal of consultative status. The new clauses in that part implied that some non-governmental organizations might not be genuinely concerned with the objectives they claimed to support, or might even be engaged in activities which ran counter to those objectives.

33. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said that if the word "genuinely" really had the meaning explained by the representative of India, the United States delegation would be unable, to its great regret, to vote in favour of the draft resolution. It would be grateful if the sponsors would delete that word.

34. Mrs. DAES (Greece) observed that it would be logical to bring the beginning of operative paragraph 2 into line with paragraph 1, and to say that the General Assembly "further expresses its deep appreciation".

35. Mr. PAOLINI (France), speaking only for his own delegation, said that the "non-governmental organizations concerned" were, of course, those which had been invited to take part in the celebration of the International Year for Human Rights, and particularly, in the Teheran Conference. If the insertion of the word "genuinely" was apt to create difficulties, he would suggest that it should be deleted so that the Committee could adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

36. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that on the whole he supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1743. Nevertheless, his delegation wished to suggest some amendments. Firstly, it suggested that the following paragraph should be inserted as the first preambular paragraph:

"Emphasizing the great importance of implementing the principles relating to human rights set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Declaration and International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination".

37. He also suggested that the following paragraph should be inserted after the fourth preambular paragraph:

"Emphasising the fact that continued, systematic mass violations of human rights may endanger international peace and security".

38. With regard to operative paragraph 3, he recalled that the question of inviting non-governmental organizations to the Teheran Conference had led to lengthy discussions. His delegation had said then that not all non-governmental organizations were the voice of the people but that some, as was common knowledge and as the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had recognized, were the voice of the Central Intelligence Agency. It was therefore right for the sponsors of the draft resolution to make a distinction between organizations which were genuinely

¹¹ Document A/7495/Add.3 (mimeographed).

concerned and the rest. His delegation suggested that the words “genuinely concerned” should be replaced by the words “whose activities contribute to the maintenance of friendly relations among States”.

39. The foregoing were merely suggestions, and he reserved the right to submit them later as formal amendments.

40. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she agreed with the views of the representative of France, and requested the sponsors to delete the word “genuinely”.

41. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) supported the draft resolution, as orally revised by the sponsors. In his view, the word “genuinely” meant simply that certain non-governmental organizations whose objectives were not in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter—for example, organizations which supported *apartheid*—were excluded.

42. Mr. NETTEL (Austria) felt that further endless discussions on non-governmental organizations must be avoided. If the amendment suggested in that regard by the Ukrainian representative was not accepted, he would request a separate vote on paragraph 3.

43. Mr. LORCH (Israel) said that he wished to reply to a statement made at the preceding meeting by the USSR delegation. He did not intend to refute all the unconvincing reasons advanced by the Soviet Union representative, particularly as the latter had refuted them himself: he had stated that many Jews living in the Soviet Union had been born there and were therefore full Soviet citizens. That being so, it would be entirely natural for the Soviet Government to show the same concern towards them as towards all other Soviet citizens.

44. The Israeli Government was not alone in feeling concern for the fate of Jews in the Soviet Union; many intellectuals from all countries, who could not be accused of encouraging the cold war—Jean-Paul Sartre and Bertrand Russell, for example—had protested against the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

45. To exonerate himself, the USSR representative had quoted figures, but had wilfully distorted the statistics. For example, he had stated that 7,500 Jews were members of Soviets, without specifying that the Soviets had a total membership of more than 2 million; that actually meant that Jews accounted for less than 0.4 per cent of the membership of the Soviets, although they were more than 1.5 per cent of the total population. Similarly, the Soviet Union representative had not pointed out that the number of Jewish university students had remained the same,

although the total number of students had nearly doubled during the past twenty years. The Soviet delegation freely quoted Lenin's works and boasted of his humanitarian activities, but seemed to forget that the writings in which Lenin denounced anti-semitism were not published in the USSR.

46. Jews in the Soviet Union should have the right to live as a group, to practise their religion and their customs, and to leave the country if they so desired. As was evidenced by many letters, Jews had not lost all interest in Judaism, contrary to what the Soviet delegation would have everyone believe.

47. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that her delegation had already replied fully to the slanderous accusations of Israel and the United States, which sought to intervene in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union. The representative of Israel complained of what he considered to be the inadequate percentage of Jews who were members of Soviets. In fact, the 4 per cent figure he had mentioned seemed to be more than adequate. However, as everyone knew, that was merely a tactic designed to divert the Committee's attention from the violations committed by Israel in the occupied territories.

48. Mr. LORCH (Israel) pointed out that he had mentioned a figure of 0.4 per cent, not 4 per cent.

49. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he regretted that the representative of Israel had not heeded his appeal and was continuing to hurl accusations at the Soviet Union. If the representative of Israel was motivated by humanitarian sentiments and wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fate of minorities, why did he concern himself only with the Jewish minority in the USSR? If a paragraph on the complaints of the world's ethnic and religious minorities had to be added to the draft resolution, the result would be not a paragraph but a whole volume, and the debate would be endless.

50. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1743, he did not see why the inclusion of the word “genuinely” in operative paragraph 3 was creating difficulties. Contrary to what the United States representative seemed to think, all non-governmental organizations were not sacrosanct and certain of them, such as some women's organizations, were inspired by absolute fanaticism which clouded their judgement. If the United States delegation wished to raise that question, why did it not submit a further draft resolution or request the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.