

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1325th
MEETING**

Monday, 1 November 1965,
at 11.30 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 66:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples (concluded)</i>	179
<i>Organization of work</i>	183

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Draft Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples (concluded) (A/C.3/L.1255 and Add.1-4)

1. Mr. HERRERA (Costa Rica) said that he wished first to thank those delegations which had striven to present a clear and universally acceptable text. Although that objective had not been achieved, and the text, which was obscure in places, was not entirely satisfactory and was open to misinterpretations, his delegation had voted in favour of it as a token of the importance it attached to the promotion of the ideals of peace among youth and to peace, which was not merely the absence of war, but a state of public order founded on truth, justice, love and understanding. The promotion of the ideals of peace was a continuing educational process which must be applied simultaneously to every sphere in order to ensure the harmonious and balanced development of the personality. In that connexion, his delegation laid stress on the predominant role of the family, and was glad that the Greek delegation had requested an express reference to it in the text of the draft. As the representative of Spain had pointed out, parental guidance was not simply a form of education like any other, but was the very basis of all preparation for life, and exercised an influence of which young people should not be deprived.

2. Mr. MUMBU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Declaration and for each of the principles it contained because of the extreme importance his Government attached to the promotion of the ideals of peace among youth and its great interest in young people generally.

3. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on principle V and on the draft Declaration as a whole and had voted against

the third paragraph of principle V because it considered that the wording of the first phrase was ambiguous and, moreover, was not a very accurate translation of the original.

4. His delegation, wishing to remove the ambiguity caused by a poor choice of words and believing that the difficulty was purely one of form, had supported the Italian representative's suggestion that that first phrase should be replaced by a more satisfactory formula, reading: "Youth organizations should be a result of the free exercise of the right of association"; it greatly regretted that that suggestion, which apparently had been acceptable to some of the sponsors, had been rejected, making it impossible for his delegation to vote in favour of a text the meaning of which no one had been able to explain.

5. The flat rejection of what his delegation had believed to be simply an improvement in the form of the text had given it the impression that perhaps the wording adopted by the Committee for the third paragraph of principle V concealed a serious difference of opinion on the substance, and that doubt, which the Committee's regrettable decision not to reopen the debate had made it impossible to dispel, had forced his delegation to abstain from voting on the draft Declaration as a whole.

6. With respect to the Committee's working methods, while his delegation considered it perfectly legitimate to close the debate once the item under discussion had been considered thoroughly and to proceed immediately to vote upon it without discussion, it nevertheless believed that it was necessary to reopen the discussion on the substance when there was a requirement to elucidate concepts which had not been made sufficiently clear, as had been the case at the meeting at which the Committee had voted. The question was an important one, since principle V, dealing with youth movements, contained provisions that were among the most important in the draft Declaration in view of the crucial nature of the training given to young people by such movements, outside school or after they had finished their schooling. It was his delegation's firm belief that such associations could not serve to promote the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples unless their organization, functioning, programmes and methods, and above all their ideology, were in strict conformity with the fundamental principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and, indeed, with the spirit of all the basic instruments of the United Nations. Only youth associations which were free—i.e., which were freely established, which operated freely with, perhaps, the impartial assistance of the State, and which young people were free

to join—could serve the ideals proclaimed in the Declaration. That was a vital point on which no ambiguity could be allowed.

7. His delegation had abstained, with regret, on the draft Declaration as a whole, although it had earlier welcomed the Romanian initiative; precisely because it attached the greatest importance to the Declaration, it had felt obliged to take a strong line concerning its wording and not to accept a form of words which was really too ambiguous.

8. His delegation hoped that it would be possible to improve the wording of the paragraph before the text was considered in plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

9. Mrs. VEDER (Netherlands) said that she had been obliged to vote against the last paragraph of principle V because the wording of that paragraph seemed to impose a line of conduct on all youth organizations, and that was at variance with the spirit of the draft Declaration, which set forth principles and defined aims to be attained. Her delegation would therefore not have been opposed to the Austrian delegation's suggestion that the words "must conform", which might affect freedom of association, should be replaced by "should conform". In that connexion, she wished to inform the Moroccan delegation that her own delegation's earlier observations on the subject had been impersonal and objective and designed only to safeguard a fundamental freedom to which all were attached; moreover, in order to allay any fears the Moroccan delegation might have as to the ideals fostered by youth in the Netherlands, she would recall that a village in Iran which had been totally destroyed by an earthquake had been rebuilt by youth organizations from the Netherlands.

10. A further reason why her delegation had voted against the last paragraph was that, in its view, there was an inconsistency between that paragraph and the three preceding ones; she did not see why the French word "doivent", which in the three preceding paragraphs was rendered by the English word "should", had to be translated as "must" in the last paragraph. The draft Declaration under discussion was an extremely important document, and care should be taken to ensure that the wording was identical in all of the five official languages.

11. Despite those reservations, her delegation had voted in favour of principle V as a whole and of the draft Declaration.

12. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) observed that the inconsistencies between the texts in the various languages were possibly based on translation problems.

13. As for the words "without discrimination" in principle IV and "without any discrimination" in principle V, she explained that her delegation interpreted them in the sense given to them in the Charter, i.e., without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

14. Her delegation had voted against the last paragraph of principle V, as amended. In the translation read out by the interpreters, which contained the

word "must", it was inconsistent with one of the fundamental purposes of the Charter, namely, the promotion of fundamental freedoms; a Government might disapprove of, or condemn an organization, but it could not, without infringing a fundamental freedom, require it to conform to the principles set forth in the Declaration; her delegation had voted against the paragraph for the further reason that it contained obligatory language which her delegation considered out of place in the Declaration whose purpose was to enunciate principles. Finally, she had learned during her years of experience with young people that they were not disposed to conform to things imposed upon them by older people; accordingly that paragraph was hardly calculated to advance the promotion of the ideals of peace and mutual respect among youth.

15. Her delegation had therefore been obliged to vote against the last paragraph of principle V, but had voted in favour of the draft Declaration as a whole, in the belief that it might help to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples, enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

16. Miss ADDISON (Ghana) said that she had abstained in the vote of the revised version of the last paragraph of principle V submitted by the Moroccan delegation because she considered that text too dogmatic and not in harmony with the rest of the draft Declaration.

17. With respect to the third paragraph of principle V, her delegation regretted that the sudden closure of the debate had prevented the Committee from reconsidering and improving the first phrase, the wording of which was unsatisfactory. It hoped, however, that the text could be improved before the vote in the plenary; it was in that hope that her delegation had voted in favour of the Declaration as a whole.

18. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that he had abstained in the vote on the text submitted by the Moroccan delegation, which he considered superfluous and open to objection because of its peremptory wording. His delegation had nevertheless voted in favour of principle V as a whole.

19. Mr. LAWREY (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Declaration as a whole but had done so with mixed feelings. It had always endorsed the idea of developing recommendations on the promotion among youth of the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples, but it had also always deemed it essential that such recommendations should be carefully drafted in clear terms, and that was something which, unfortunately, the Committee had not been able to achieve. The text as adopted was not a synthesis of the views of the international community, but rather a patchwork document leaving much to be desired.

20. His delegation had accordingly been compelled to abstain in the vote on the third paragraph of principle V, the wording of which it thought obscure both in English and in French. The difficulties that had arisen in that connexion might have been ironed out if the Committee had been able, through a reopening of the debate, to consider the text more closely.

21. His delegation had also been obliged, in a spirit of objectivity, to vote against the text proposed by the Moroccan representative for the fourth paragraph of principle V, because of its peremptory and categorical tone. In its present wording, that paragraph might, while seeking to promote certain ideals, impair other fundamental freedoms.

22. While his delegation had voted in favour of the draft Declaration as a whole, it shared the hope expressed by the French and Ghanaian delegations that the text might be improved and thus acquire its full weight.

23. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) said that although she appreciated the spirit of compromise which had prompted the Moroccan delegation, she had abstained in the vote on the new version of the fourth paragraph of principle V, which because of its excessively categorical tone did not seem to her appropriate in an instrument such as the Declaration.

24. Her delegation had voted against the third paragraph of principle V chiefly because it thought that the expression "of their own choosing" was ambiguous.

25. Owing to those reservations, her delegation had been compelled to abstain in the vote on the draft Declaration as a whole, despite its very keen and sincere wish to see that text adopted unanimously.

26. Mrs. DELLA GHERARDESCA (Italy) said that her delegation greatly regretted having had to abstain in the vote on principle V and on the draft Declaration as a whole. It had done so because it felt that the Committee had not yet taken adequate pains to work out, in all working languages, in accordance with the mandate given it by the Organization and in accordance with the desires of UNESCO, a text which could command universal support.

27. Her delegation would gladly vote in favour of the draft Declaration in the General Assembly if the third and fourth paragraphs of principle V were modified.

28. Miss LOPES (Portugal) said that her delegation endorsed the spirit in which the Declaration had been prepared and would support all measures which might promote, at both the national and international levels, the achievement of the objectives of peace and understanding between peoples.

29. Nevertheless, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft Declaration as a whole, because there were certain references in the draft that fell outside its general context and her delegation also found the third and fourth paragraphs of principle V not fully satisfactory, furthermore, the text in document A/C.3/L.1264 had for various reasons called forth reservations from some delegations.

30. Mr. MURUGESU (Malaysia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of principle V as a whole. It had abstained, however, in the vote on the third and fourth paragraphs, because it feared that the first part of the third paragraph might give rise to confusion and because it felt that the fourth paragraph was not in harmony with the objectives and principles set forth in the draft Declaration. His

delegation would have preferred to see the fourth paragraph maintained in its original form.

31. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she had voted against the text proposed by Morocco, because she considered the word "must" out of keeping with the aims and principles stated in the Declaration. She also felt that a peremptory tone was psychologically undesirable in an instrument addressed to young people.

32. Her delegation wished to make it clear that, although it had voted in favour of principle V, it could not accept that colonialism should, in the present day, be linked with the idea of racial discrimination or of violation of human rights. Although that was not her delegation's view, some might claim to discern such a link in the wording of the first paragraph of principle V. The United Kingdom had unreservedly adopted the principle of self-determination with regard to its colonies, whose attainment of independence it was prepared to promote in keeping with the desires and interests of the peoples concerned.

33. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the third paragraph of principle V. The opening words made no sense either in the English text, or, it seemed, in the French and Spanish texts. She hoped that the matter could be rectified at a later stage.

34. Her delegation had also abstained in the vote on the fourth paragraph, because its tone seemed inappropriate to a declaration which, in contrast to a convention, did not impose obligations on Governments and should simply set out desirable objectives. The fact that the various language versions of principle V differed made the text even more open to criticism.

35. Mrs. SNEZHKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) commended the Romanian delegation for having taken the initiative in placing on the Assembly's agenda the important question of which the Committee had just completed consideration. She also thanked the sponsors of amendments and all delegations which had co-operated in producing a text that had been approved without dissent.

36. Her delegation hoped that the draft Declaration would serve as a basis in different countries for educational activities aimed at instilling in youth the ideals of peace and understanding between peoples and that it would facilitate the work of youth organizations and educators. The text adopted should be circulated as widely as possible, particularly in the countries which had taken part in its preparation, so that it might reach families, universities and youth organizations.

37. Her delegation, which had always attributed a leading role to the family in the upbringing of the young, nevertheless believed that without the support of society, the schools and the media of information, the family could not properly raise children in the spirit of the ideals proclaimed in the Declaration. It was for that reason that it had been unable to support the insertion of the word "major" in principle II.

38. It was precisely because of the importance it attached to the training given to young people by

appropriate organizations that her delegation had supported the Moroccan amendment which would oblige such organizations to conform to the principles of the Declaration. It held that the responsibility of such associations was particularly great in a world threatened by war, where effective measures must be taken to develop in young people the ideals of peace and understanding which would enable them to ignore the war propaganda of certain groups.

39. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he would make only a few comments, bearing in mind rule 129 of the rules of procedure which prohibited sponsors of a text from explaining their vote.

40. With reference to the Moroccan proposal, his delegation still felt that the original text of the fourth paragraph of principle V would have been preferable. However, the Moroccan text was a useful compromise, since the original text had not been acceptable to many delegations.

41. A number of delegations had expressed the view that the fourth paragraph, because of its denunciatory tone, had not been appropriate in a declaration. But the question was whether a Government which desired peace and international understanding should not have the capacity to intervene when an organization in its country incited the young to war.

42. He referred in that regard to the case of a country which, during the 1930's, had been obliged to enact a law—the Public Order Act of 1936—in order to combat organizations one of whose aims had been to eliminate a large group of society and whose ideas, taken up by other associations, had led to the 1939 war.

43. As demonstrated by that particular case, there came a time when States must take steps against associations whose ideas constituted a threat to peace. That was why his delegation, although opposing the Moroccan amendment, thought that it was not out of place in the draft Declaration and that it might have been included with certain drafting changes. It might have stated, for example, that youth organizations were bound to abide by the ideals of the Declaration.

44. As to the third paragraph of principle V, his delegation considered that the wording left something to be desired, but, seen in its context, it had been sufficiently clear to satisfy most delegations.

45. The CHAIRMAN observed that rule 129 of the rules of procedure was not strictly applicable in the present case, since the various proposals had been subjected to many changes and sub-amendments in the course of the debate.

46. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that he would merely make a few observations concerning the word "humanity" which appeared in principle II of the draft Declaration.

47. Agreement had not been reached on the meaning of the word and that might lead to difficulties in the plenary meeting. That point and others should therefore be clarified, as several delegations, including the French delegation, had suggested.

48. The word "humanity" seemed to lend itself to widely divergent interpretations, since, according to an article published in The New York Times of 31 October 1965, an Afrikaner university was to be established, which Senator Jan De Klerk, Minister of Education, Art and Science, had promised would eliminate humanism, regarded as linked with communism and liberalism and therefore as constituting a danger for the Afrikaner way of life.

49. The delegations which had voted against the retention of the word in principle II might be well advised to reconsider their attitude. That would be the best means of destroying the very special conception of humanity which seemed to prevail at Johannesburg.

50. He wondered whether the United Kingdom Government, whose representative had said that colonialism did not now imply any violation of human rights, was satisfied with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and South Africa.

51. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) said that he had voted against the third paragraph of principle V because he considered it unclear. He associated himself with the representatives of France, Ghana, Australia and Italy in requesting that the paragraph should be reworded in order to indicate clearly that young people should establish and run their own organizations, with or without State protection, according to national practice.

52. His delegation had abstained in the vote on principle V of the Declaration but had voted in favour of the draft Declaration as a whole since it approved its aims.

53. Mr. JATIVA (Ecuador) said that he had voted against the third paragraph of principle V because he thought its wording ambiguous and felt that a declaration should state its objectives clearly. He had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan amendment because he felt that its excessively imperative wording might be prejudicial to freedom of association. However, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft as a whole because it whole-heartedly approved of its spirit and objectives which were consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

54. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that it was to her country that the Tanzanian representative had referred, when he had spoken of the Public Order Act of 1936. The object of that legislation had been, not to limit freedom of expression, but to put an end to breaches of public order.

55. Her delegation had opposed the substitution of "must" for "should" in the English version of principle V because it considered that an excessively mandatory wording might appear to restrict freedom of expression and the freedom of association of young people.

56. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he had been one of the strongest proponents of the word "humanism" during the consideration of principle II of the Declaration. It was regrettable that that word which appeared in the French and Spanish versions of the text adopted by the Third Committee

had not been used in the English version. He would like to see the word used in all three versions of the text and would vote accordingly at the plenary meeting. It would be no use adopting the Declaration if its contents were not to be the same in the different language versions. His delegation would therefore pursue its efforts to ensure the inclusion of the word and the concept of humanism in the text of principle II.

57. Mr. MONTENEGRO MEDRANO (Nicaragua) said that he had not been present during the vote, but would have supported the draft as a whole. The retention of the last paragraph of principle V had been essential, particularly since the condemnation of non-peaceful activities was a logical corollary of the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration itself. Since bodies corporate could not be subject to penal sanctions at the international level, he wondered what position should be taken with regard to an organization which did not observe the principles of the Declaration. His delegation would not have been able to support the Moroccan proposal which tended to limit freedom of expression and was incompatible with the Constitution of Nicaragua.

58. Miss KING (Jamaica) said that she had voted in favour of principle V and was sure that it would have a great influence on the minds of young people and adults and on governmental organizations dealing with youth. The declaration would be useful both for developed countries and those striving to develop. She had not been able to support the Moroccan amendment because she considered its tone too imperative and incompatible with the spirit of the Declaration. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on the fourth paragraph, the wording of which it thought open to criticism. It endorsed the remarks of the Italian and French delegations and hoped that a more satisfactory text which would command a larger number of votes could be evolved before the vote in plenary meeting.

59. Mrs. VILLGRATTNER (Austria) said that she had voted in favour of the third paragraph of principle V, although its introductory sentence was somewhat obscure. However, the interpretations given of that text had convinced her that freedom of association and the freedom to establish youth organizations were not in danger. She nevertheless considered that it would be desirable to devise a more satisfactory wording before the draft was considered in plenary meeting. She had abstained in the vote on the fourth paragraph of principle V, whose form she disapproved as being too imperative and incompatible with the spirit of the Declaration. If it was desired to promote the ideals of peace and mutual understanding, youth organizations should be left free to work to that end without being given specific instructions which would probably be to no avail. Apart from the fact that young people were not very receptive to formal orders, the function of a declaration was not to impose anything on anyone. Moreover, she considered that the formula adopted was somewhat limited in scope and that the proposed condemnation of organizations which did not observe the principles of the Declaration should perhaps extend to other persons playing a part in the training of youth,

particularly teachers and certain adult organizations whose activities were connected with those of youth organizations.

60. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan amendment. She urged all delegations to show a spirit of co-operation so that a text might be prepared which could be adopted unanimously in plenary meeting.

61. Mr. ABDEL-RAHIM (Sudan) said that he had voted in favour of the draft Declaration as a whole and whole-heartedly supported its objectives. He had abstained in the vote on the third paragraph of principle V, not because he had any reservations concerning its contents, but because he thought the wording unsatisfactory. He agreed with the criticism which had been voiced concerning the English and French versions and thought that the first sentence was not clear in any of the languages. The text should make clear who would do the "choosing". Was it the organizations or the young people themselves? He had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan amendment because he considered its wording unsatisfactory also.

62. Mr. SAKSENA (India) was pleased that the Committee had adopted the draft Declaration. He had voted in favour of the third paragraph of principle V but felt that its wording was not entirely satisfactory. He had abstained in the vote on the fourth paragraph because he considered that a declaration should enunciate principles and not formal obligations.

63. Mr. EL-HADDAD (Yemen) paid tribute to the spirit of co-operation shown by the United Kingdom and the United States delegations in withdrawing amendments which really challenged the principles of the Charter. He welcomed the fact that the draft Declaration mentioned the final abolition of colonialism among the objectives to be pursued by youth organizations. He had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan amendment, but had supported the Declaration as a whole.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that a number of delegations had spoken about the wording of the last paragraph of principle V, as proposed orally by the representative of Morocco and adopted by the Committee at its previous meeting. While the word "must" had been used in the English simultaneous interpretation, it would be left to the respective translation sections to prepare the official texts in the various languages.

Organization of work

65. Mr. ZOUANOS (Cyprus) requested, on behalf of the Afro-Asian countries, that the time-limit for the submission of amendments to the implementation clauses of the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (agenda item 58) should be extended to 4 November 1965, at 6 p.m.

66. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that, at the request of the Indian representative, that time-limit had already been extended from 28 to 29 October. Consequently, and in view of the delay in the Committee's work, he felt that the officers of the Committee could not take the decision themselves. Under rule 124 of the rules of procedure

of the General Assembly, when a proposal had been adopted or rejected, it might not be reconsidered at the same session unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decided. He therefore suggested that the Committee should vote on the proposal of the representative of Cyprus.

67. Mr. SAKSENA (India), supported by Mr. ZOU-PANOS (Cyprus), Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria), Miss ADDISON (Ghana) and Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), asked the Chairman not to put the proposal to the vote. By agreeing to extend the time-limit for the submission of amend-

ments, the officers of the Committee would be allowing delegations time to finish their consultations and to prepare a text which might perhaps obviate interminable discussion in Committee.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that he did not wish to make an arbitrary ruling. He therefore proposed to hold some consultations and to announce his decision at the next meeting. In his decision, he would be guided by a desire to ensure that the work of the Committee progressed in the most satisfactory manner possible.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.