



CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 54:</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:</i>	
(a) <i>Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued);</i>	
(b) <i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued) . . . . .</i>	<i>157</i>

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 54

Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance:

- (a) Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued) (A/6660 and Corr.1, A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. V);
- (b) Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance (continued) (A/6660 and Corr.1, A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. V; A/C.3/L.1456 to 1458, A/C.3/L.1460, A/C.3/L.1461)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. MWITENDE (Rwanda) said that religious conflicts were foreign to his country. Until the end of the nineteenth century, there had existed a single traditional religion in Rwanda. The first Christian missionaries who had reached the country some eighty years ago encountered enormous difficulties with the political authorities, not because the latter were opposed to the new religions as such, but because they feared that their dissemination was designed to foment the rebellion of the population against them. Although there had been victims among the converted, the authorities finally appreciated the benefits of missionary activity in the field of education and medical care. The traditional religion, which originally was the religion of the whole population, was now practised only by 56 per cent, while some 37.5 per cent were Catholics, 6 per cent Protestant and 5 per cent Moslems.

2. The Constitution of Rwanda guaranteed all citizens freedom of conscience and the right to practise their religion freely and his delegation noted with pleasure that the spirit of the document before the Committee (A/6660 and Corr.1) corresponded almost exactly to the situation already existing in Rwanda.

3. On the other hand, his delegation understood the point of view of representatives who felt that, as the

draft Convention had emerged very recently from the Commission on Human Rights, Governments should be prepared by means of a prior declaration on the same subject. However, it was quite acceptable to adopt the Declaration after the Convention. He saw no reason to postpone consideration of the draft Convention until the twenty-third session of the Assembly, as some delegations had suggested, particularly in view of the Assembly's appeal that study of the draft Convention should be concluded before 1968. The Committee should hasten to consider the draft article by article, together with those amendments which improved the text, so as to approve it without delay.

4. Article III, paragraph 2 (h) was unacceptable to his delegation; the question of religious oaths should be left to the discretion of each State. Various young States had made provision in their Constitutions for religious oaths, with the aim of establishing their institutions on a religious basis. On the other hand, he did not share the objections which had been raised to article IV, paragraph 3, because a child deprived of his parents should be brought up by his guardian and, failing him, by the State. With regard to the reference to anti-Semitism, he thanked the representative of Israel for his willingness to compromise on that point; that would enable the Committee to conclude debate on that question. His delegation opposed the Syrian proposal to add the words "Nazism, Fascism and Zionism" because the list would not be exhaustive and because those terms were political rather than religious in character. For the same reason, he would like the word "anti-Semitism" to be eliminated.

5. Finally, he did not agree with the assertion made by the representative of the USSR that religious freedom also implied the freedom to disseminate anti-religious propaganda. The acceptance of that idea might give rise to serious conflicts in countries where several religions coexisted.

6. Mr. GUERMAZI (Tunisia) recalled that the Commission on Human Rights had sought to justify its failure to present a draft declaration by explaining that it had not had time to do so. That reason was neither adequate nor satisfactory. On the grounds both of logic and United Nations practice, the Declaration should come before the Convention.

7. The Tunisian delegation, whose country had undergone foreign occupation and colonialism, considered extremely important all questions relating to fundamental rights and freedoms. That fact was illustrated by its signature and ratification of all conventions concerned with such rights and freedoms. The Constitution of the Republic of Tunisia guaranteed free-

dom of belief and protected the freedom of each individual to practise his religion. The Government had created among the citizens an atmosphere of comprehension and co-operation and had wiped out religious intolerance, which was a legacy of colonialism. Tunisian law also protected places of religion and repressed all incitement to intolerance. Recently, when there had been incitement to hatred and religious intolerance, the guilty persons had been arrested, brought before the courts and sentenced.

8. Turning to the procedure which the Committee should follow in dealing with the item, he felt it was more logical and sensible to examine and approve a declaration first. He therefore suggested that the Commission on Human Rights should reconsider the draft Convention, bearing in mind what had been said in the Third Committee. It would be very useful to define the common objectives in a draft declaration before choosing the means of carrying them out through an international instrument. Furthermore, the text of the draft Convention was incomplete and unsatisfactory, since it had been necessary to include additions and since it contained words and phrases which weakened it, for example, the term "anti-Semitism". Anti-Semitism was a strictly European phenomenon of mainly racial character; hence its mention in the Convention was out of place. His delegation suggested that either other forms of religious intolerance should be included or that the word "anti-Semitism" should be eliminated. He did not think that the establishment of a working group, as proposed by New Zealand (A/C.3/L.1458), would be either useful or effective, unless such a group was fully representative.

9. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) said that the Committee should study the draft Convention very carefully, particularly because it expressed the points of view of the Western clerical States, which had held a majority in the Commission on Human Rights at the time of its preparation. The text did not therefore reflect the position of States whose inhabitants adhered to such religions as Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism; nor did it reflect that of States which professed atheistic doctrines, whose population constituted a third of the world's inhabitants. For that reason, her delegation could not support the New Zealand proposal to set up a working group. The Committee should study the articles on implementation measures once it had discussed and approved the substantive articles of the draft.

10. Her delegation felt that the title of the draft Convention did not correspond to its contents and consequently she supported the proposal of the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.1460). It did not agree with article IV of the draft, because beliefs were the private concern of individuals and hence also of children, who alone should decide that matter for themselves when they reached the appropriate age. Moreover, she saw no need to mention anti-Semitism in article VI.

11. In discussing the elimination of discrimination on the grounds of religion, the Committee could not ignore the obvious manifestations of that type of discrimination which were taking place in South Viet-Nam. There, a corrupt Government made up of Catholics was applying repressive measures against the Buddhist majority and was serving the interests

of the United States aggressors, who were attacking the people of South Viet-Nam with the most modern weapons and were burning their pagodas and temples.

12. Her delegation could not fail to observe that the Israel representative, who had defended so vigorously the rights of the Jews not to suffer discrimination, had said nothing about the sufferings of the population of the territories now occupied by Israel.

13. In Mongolia religion was separate from the State and the school; it was a personal matter for each citizen. Article 76 of the Constitution guaranteed the equality of rights of all citizens without distinction as to sex, race, nationality, religion or social origin or position.

14. Finally, her delegation considered that an international convention on the question should reflect the Constitution and opinions of Mongolia and the Constitutions and opinions of other States.

15. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) said that religion was of special importance to his country. Saudi Arabia had seen the birth of Islam and was the custodian of some of Islam's holiest shrines. Many passages from the Koran showed that Islam rejected intolerance and favoured the peaceful coexistence of religions and nations. To a Moslem, to be tolerant and compassionate to others, irrespective of colour, ethnic origin or religion, was an article of faith. For that reason, non-Moslems living in Moslem lands had always enjoyed freedom of worship and their shrines had been protected by law. Those who had attempted to slander Islam should be reminded that, whenever there was a wave of persecution in Europe, the victims sought refuge in Moslem lands.

16. His delegation stressed the religious persecution that had been perpetrated against the indigenous Christian and Moslem people of Palestine by aliens who had usurped the ancestral homeland. The attitude of those who now occupied Palestine was based upon a political thinking that advocated exclusiveness to those of their faith only and rejected those of other faiths.

17. Article III of the draft was completely unacceptable because its provisions would entail interference in the domestic affairs of each State. Article VI was also unacceptable in its present form. The word "anti-Semitism" was a misnomer; the word used should be "anti-Judaism", although it was doubtful whether there was an anti-Judaist movement in the modern world. The overwhelming majority of the Semitic people were the Arabs. The Jews of Europe and the United States and most of the Jews living in Palestine came from a separate ethnic group. Consequently, the real anti-Semitic practices were those now being perpetrated against the Christian and Moslem Arabs of Palestine by the very same people who were given at all times shelter and asylum by the forefathers of their victims.

18. The Zionists had deceived the world and made it believe that Palestine was an unpopulated area. The present occupants of Palestine expelled the Christian and Moslem Arabs as a result of massacres such as that of Deir Yassin, documented by the British Jewish writer, John Kimche. In that massacre more than 500 innocent Arabs died, including more than 200 women and children.

19. His delegation was opposed to the enumeration of certain religions in the text of the Convention because such an enumeration could never be exhaustive and would exclude many minority religions and those which might arise in the future. For that reason, it believed that any enumeration of that kind should be eliminated from the draft. His delegation considered the New Zealand proposal to be unacceptable because the Committee should examine the substantive provisions before considering implementation measures.

20. Mr. SANCHEZ GAVITO (Mexico) said that Mexico considered the problem of the draft Convention exclusively from the technical standpoint, reserving its opinions on political conflicts for the appropriate forms. Its views on the subject were derived not from the experience of Mexico but rather from that of the inter-American regional system in the matter of the protection of human rights; knowledge of what the New World had done and was doing should be useful for the Committee in its work.

21. The Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, had adopted the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, which corresponded to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Statute of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had been adopted in mid-1960. In drafting regulations relating not only to the structure but also to the powers of that Commission, it had been necessary to consider and try to solve a problem that held a prominent place among those with which the United Nations had to deal in its efforts to protect human rights on a world scale: the problem of implementation measures. That problem had two aspects. The first was that of choosing between bodies empowered to receive complaints about violations either of human rights in general or alternatively—as in the case of the draft which the Committee was studying—one of those rights in particular. If that was not settled, the question of implementation would be indefinitely deferred; if it was settled, it would remain to be determined whether States, institutions and individuals could formulate such complaints. The second problem had to do with the nature of the procedure which the submission of complaints would set in motion; once a decision had been taken on procedure, States would have to define the way in which they were going to assume the obligation to submit to the procedure agreed upon. The Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) had at first ruled out the possibility of Governments addressing communications on the subject to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and later it had decided not to empower it to receive and investigate complaints from individuals, with the result that the Commission had begun to function as an academic and Utopian body. That state of affairs could not continue and accordingly the Second Special Inter-American Conference, held at Rio de Janeiro in November 1965, had adopted a resolution granting the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights powers to receive and rule on complaints from individuals about violations of human rights. In practice, the results of that system had been good; with a single exception, all States members of the OAS were responding promptly to the communications

received from the Commission, investigating complaints and taking the necessary steps to put an end to violations.

22. The inter-American experience showed, firstly, that regardless of the label borne by a document concerning the protection of human rights, it would be nothing more than a declaration if it did not include clear measures of implementation, and, secondly, that the question whether the basic instrument was or was not subject to ratification was of lesser importance, since its entry into force did not depend on that formality: by means of a resolution alone the Americas had established a series of implementation measures for the international protection of the most fundamental human rights. The method adopted by the inter-American regional system could be called weak, for it did not require either the drafting or the publication of any ruling. There was another even weaker method, which was to oblige States to submit periodic reports on the measures adopted to give effect to the substantive provisions, while at the other extreme there was the method embodied in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

23. The Committee's most urgent task was to reach a consensus on measures of implementation to guarantee freedom of conscience, for, in the absence of a definite criterion with respect to that matter, a fruitful discussion of the substantive articles would be inconceivable. For that reason, his delegation would be unable to vote on specific texts until a system of implementation acceptable at least to a great majority was devised. In deciding upon its method of work, it should be borne in mind that, if the Commission on Human Rights had transmitted an incomplete document to the General Assembly, that was because approval of the draft required a political decision which it was not for the Commission but for the Third Committee to take. Finally, he suggested that, once the general debate was concluded, the Committee should express its views on measures of implementation.

24. Mr. RICARDO (Colombia) noted that in the general debate some speakers had been critical of the procedure followed in submitting the draft Convention to the Committee, saying that it was illogical because the Convention should have been preceded by a draft declaration. He was also aware that because the Commission on Human Rights had not studied the preliminary draft on measures of implementation the draft Convention as received by the Committee was incomplete. However, taking into account the explanations given in the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. V) and the time spent by the Commission on Human Rights in drafting the preamble and the twelve substantive articles (A/6660 and Corr.1, annex I), he thought it should be acknowledged that the text had merit. Everyone realized that the subject was complex and that it was difficult to harmonize the differing points of view; but, while it might be necessary to perfect the document in its formal aspects, that problem would not be as serious as the one which would be created if the United Nations failed to take a position on the matter, for the instrument affirmed

principles relating to the human person which would have greater weight if they were proclaimed by the United Nations.

25. The rights embodied in the draft Convention had been recognized in the Constitution of his own country. For example, article 53 guaranteed freedom of conscience and provided that no one could be molested because of his religious beliefs or obliged to observe practices which were contrary to his conscience; it likewise recognized the freedom of all forms of worship compatible with Christian morality and the laws. Almost the entire population of Colombia professed the Catholic faith. Yet despite that overwhelming Catholic majority, the beliefs of others were respected and they were permitted to practise their religion in an atmosphere of tolerance. Moreover, the Colombian people owed to the Church certain services which were of indisputable merit, in the fields of both education and welfare.

26. He appealed to the members of the Committee to support the recognition and implementation of one of the principles which related to the essential nature of the individual. The material and the earthly disappeared but the spiritual endured. Mankind was confronted today with serious problems in such fields as housing, food, health and education. All those elements were vital, but something more was necessary: the profession of a belief. Therefore the United Nations could neither evade nor postpone the task of taking a decision on the highly important subject before it.

27. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that history was full of holy wars, civilizing missions and movements of repression. Kenya did not want history to repeat itself and therefore supported in principle the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. Its Constitution guaranteed freedom of conscience, thought and religion, and the freedom of the individual to change his belief and to manifest and propagate his religion. He thought that in order to safeguard human dignity all the countries of the world should recognize the importance of those freedoms and he hoped that a draft Convention acceptable to all Member States would be concluded.

28. Although his delegation shared the view expressed by some members of the Committee that it would have been better to begin with a declaration and then go on to the Convention, it appreciated the difficulties with which the Commission on Human Rights had had to contend, and, because it felt that the task of eliminating all forms of religious intolerance was of paramount importance, it was prepared to consider the draft Convention first. However, he would ask other delegations not to prolong the discussion or introduce controversial matters which would only slow down the Committee's work.

29. Turning to the specific articles of the draft Convention, he thought article III was too detailed and might lead to difficulties in connexion with the various concepts which its sub-paragraphs embodied. For example, those in paragraph 2 required clarification or amendment; specifically, sub-paragraph (d) went too far in asking States to jeopardize their foreign exchange reserves by allowing the importation of

certain objects or foods used in religious observances. His delegation shared the concern expressed by a number of speakers with regard to sub-paragraph (g) and also felt that sub-paragraph (h) was incomplete: it was not enough simply to ensure freedom from any compulsion to take an oath of a religious nature, for the manner in which an oath was taken was also important. That clause should therefore be amended to read: "Freedom from compulsion to take an oath of a religious nature or to take any oath in a manner which is contrary to his religion or belief".

30. The introduction into article VI of examples of religious denominations, groups or sects would give rise to endless polemics. It was true that certain groups had suffered more than others, but that was not sufficient reason to single them out in the Convention, which would be effective only if it applied to all peoples. He therefore opposed the inclusion of the word "anti-Semitism" or the word "anti-Judaism", as suggested by the representative of Israel. A reference in that provision to any religious or racial group would in itself constitute a form of discrimination.

31. His delegation felt that the New Zealand proposal (A/C.3/L.1458) was premature and that the draft Convention as a whole should be considered by the Committee. Also, it was his delegation's understanding that the preparation of measures for the implementation of conventions was the duty of the General Assembly. He therefore would not support the proposal in its present form. Finally, he expressed his delegation's intention to co-operate fully in the work on the draft Convention so that it could be ready for signature during the International Year for Human Rights.

32. Mr. LVALLE (Guatemala) said that Church-State relations in Guatemala evolved in an atmosphere of harmony and concord, and in a spirit of the utmost tolerance. In his view, no State could claim that it had achieved a perfect solution to the question of religion; however, the way it had been solved in Guatemala was highly satisfactory. Since the fundamental principles behind the draft Convention also underlay Guatemalan legislation and were enshrined in Guatemala's Constitution, which proclaimed tolerance for all creeds, freedom from discrimination against all religions, the organic and functional separation of Church and State, and recognized the juridical personality of all churches.

33. Efforts to promote religious tolerance by means of an international instrument had reached their peak at the forty-second session of the Economic and Social Council. At the present stage, there was an urgent need to come to certain decisions, which could not be postponed, on such as whether the Convention should be published before the Declaration, and on the programme of work of the Commission and the system of measures of implementation.

34. With regard to the priority of the Declaration, he had not been convinced by the arguments of those who advocated that it was indispensable on the grounds that the Convention must first be given an ideological basis; the principle of religious tolerance was in no way revolutionary nor an innovation. It might be

appropriate for the Declaration to precede the Convention, but it was not essential; the primary task was to open the Convention to States for signature before 1968, the International Year for Human Rights, as requested in General Assembly resolution 2081 (XX).

35. His delegation was prepared to support any procedural proposal which would speed up the work without detriment to the results.

36. He regretted that the measures of implementation had not been included in the draft text, but he did not think that that was an insurmountable problem since the Committee could benefit from the experience it had already acquired in devising control machinery for violations of human rights embodied in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In working out the measures of implementation, the Committee should try to combine the maximum degree of enforcement with the possibility of securing the greatest number of ratifications and accessions, without, however, losing sight of the fact that such measures should be in harmony and in conformity with the other systems for the protection of human rights established by the United Nations.

37. Miss ALEXANDER (Guyana) said that the principles contained in the draft Convention presented no problems to her delegation, since the legal system in Guyana fully guaranteed all forms of freedom of conscience, religion and belief. The Constitution allowed recourse to the High Court to any person who alleged that his religious freedom had been or was likely to be infringed, and that right was supplemented by the institution of the Ombudsman, who was empowered to investigate any allegation of discrimination which might cause administrative injustice. In addition, by contrast with the colonial era when little account had been taken of the diverse historical and cultural elements in Guyana, the present Government had instituted by law equal distribution of religious holidays and also fostered the free interchange of ideas between the various religious groups, and between such groups and the Government, on any important problem dealing with religion.

38. While, the text of the draft Convention was generally acceptable, there were some elements which might present problems of interpretation. For example, since what was now the seventh preambular paragraph had previously appeared immediately after the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "in such matters" in that paragraph were meaningless. Therefore, the seventh preambular paragraph should be reworded to read "Concerned by manifestations of religious intolerance and of discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief still in evidence in some areas of the world".

39. Article III, paragraph 1 (a), raised another problem of interpretation since there seemed to be a contradiction between the words "without being subjected either to any of the limitations referred to in article XII" and the text of article XII itself, which stated that nothing in the Convention should be construed to preclude a State Party from prescribing by law such limitations as were necessary. The

contradiction could be eliminated by deleting the phrase in question from article III, and by limiting the scope of article XII so that it did not prejudice the freedom of choice laid down in article III, paragraph 1 (a).

40. Another problem of interpretation occurred in article IV, paragraph 2, since the Convention was aimed, not at individuals, but at the States Parties, and that paragraph referred only to the duty of parents to inculcate in their children tolerance for the religion or belief of others. Accordingly, if the paragraph as a whole was to be included in the draft Convention, it would be more appropriate if it required the States Parties to bring to the attention of parents their responsibilities in that respect.

41. In addition to the problems of interpretation, article II was repetitious and should therefore be deleted and its ideas incorporated in the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs. In any case, the form of the article was inconsistent with that of the other articles in the Convention.

42. Lastly, there was no article which safeguarded the freedom of the individual to contract a marriage or to be party to its dissolution without being subjected to any discrimination because of the requirements of certain religious doctrines. That was a very serious problem for many States.

43. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that the absence of freedom together with religious fanaticism, combined in many cases with political ambition, had been the cause of incalculable misfortune and suffering. Man had waged a constant battle against such senseless behaviour since the dawn of history. Religious intolerance had certainly caused crimes, but the injustices committed by atheism, which considered religion a social defect, had been no less serious. Nevertheless, on many occasions, the problem of religion had been nothing but a screen for underlying political motives, and he was concerned that the same might happen within the Third Committee. The aim of the draft was not to protect States, but to safeguard the rights of the individual and to protect future generations from harmful traditions and prejudices which were deeply rooted in religion.

44. Being the work of man, the draft Convention would probably have a number of faults; however, since all States agreed that religious intolerance should be brought to an end, and had already included the basic principles of the Convention in their legislation, the Committee should put aside all delaying tactics and immediately begin a specific discussion on the preamble and the articles approved by the Commission on Human Rights, together with any reservations and amendments which might be appropriate. The remainder of the Convention should be referred back to the Commission, together with the optional protocol submitted by India, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic and Upper Volta (A/C.3/L.1457). In that way it should be possible to adopt the draft Convention in its entirety by 1968.

45. He emphasized that his country would welcome any United Nations document aimed at protecting and expanding the practice and observance of human rights and that, in the specific case of freedom of religion,

the Constitution of Panama fully guaranteed the free exercise of all religions and religious convictions, with restrictions relating only to the security of the State and public morality; such protection was appropriately supplemented by the relevant provisions of the penal system.

46. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) said that the elimination of religious intolerance was an objective very dear to the hearts of the Irish people, who had suffered grievously from such intolerance. It was easy to comprehend, in the context of that bitter experience of religious intolerance, how it came about that the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of religion had always been fundamental to the philosophy of the independence movements in her country and that, in the part of Ireland which was independent, that principle was a corner-stone of national policy, enshrined in the Constitution and faithfully implemented. The elaboration by the United Nations of a draft international convention on the subject was therefore a source of satisfaction to her delegation.

47. In her country, virtually the entire population professed the Christian religion, a large majority being members of the Catholic Church. At the same time, the Constitution, while recognizing and honouring religion, guaranteed the freedom of conscience of all citizens and their right to express freely their convictions, to assemble peaceably and to form associations. Her delegation had had some initial difficulty with article 1, paragraph (a), of the draft Convention, inasmuch as it appeared to equate religion and disbelief. However, on closer examination she was satisfied that the draft Convention did not purport to pass judgement on any particular religious belief, or on unbelief, but was solely concerned with protecting the rights of individuals and groups of individuals—as the representatives of Jamaica and of the Netherlands had pointed out at the 820th meeting of the Commission on Human Rights on 24 March 1965. A secondary difficulty was that the word "belief" might refer to a secular or political belief. The context, however, clarified its meaning and her delegation realized that the expression "religion or belief", though imperfect, was probably the best possible formula. Nevertheless, it was important to bear in mind the difference between religion and other types of belief. Religion had a social aspect and expressed itself in numerous external manifestations such as attendance at church, participation in pilgrimages and other activities stemming from the universal nature of the great religions. Other types of belief involved no such external manifestations. Delegations which had criticized article III as being too detailed seemed to have lost sight of that essential difference.

48. In some respects, the draft Convention was less detailed than it might have been. For example, there was no specific prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, which survived in such fields as elections, housing and employment. As Great Britain continued to exercise sovereignty over one area which was historically part of her country, her delegation had been heartened to hear the representative of that country express strong support for religious tolerance.

49. It was not admissible to question, in the context of a document on religious freedom, the principle that the international community had a legitimate interest in the exercise of human rights throughout the world. While she appreciated the necessity for safeguarding national sovereignty and security, it was better to deal with that aspect under the provisions of articles XI and XII rather than by truncating the substantive articles. Her delegation opposed the mention of anti-Semitism, as it had done in connexion with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Intolerance or discrimination against any and all religious faiths was equally abhorrent to the Irish people. It would not be practicable, however, to enumerate all persecuted religions and to mention only one, or a few manifestations of that pernicious phenomenon would be, to say the least, invidious.

50. As to the implementation articles, she agreed with the representative of the United Arab Republic that delegations could only take up a final position in the matter once the substantive articles had been adopted. She therefore considered the proposals in documents A/C.3/L.1456 and A/C.3/L.1457 premature. Nevertheless, taking as a basis the draft articles before the Committee, which her delegation found largely acceptable, she did not regard the implementation articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as appropriate. The implementation articles of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance should correspond to those of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which, like the former, dealt with one specific area of human rights.

51. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel), exercising her right of reply, said that the general purpose of the United Nations was to create a better and more peaceful world, to eliminate prejudice and to promote tolerance. An elementary pre-condition for the achievement of that objective was integrity and objectivity. Although she realized that it was at times impossible to be completely objective or to avoid emotional involvement, she had to point out that statements made at previous meetings by representatives of various Arab States were a distressing and disturbing example of inaccuracy, perversion of fact, quotations out of context and deliberate falsehoods, which could only add fuel to the fire. The population of Israel was certainly ethnically heterogeneous, but it was bound together by a common religion, a common language and a common history of persecution and suffering. It was also true that many Jews were not Zionists in the sense that they envisaged their own future in Israel. Israel had primarily absorbed the homeless, the persecuted, the humiliated and the frightened. The only war which Israel had contemplated waging was the war against the desert, ignorance and disease. In 1947, when Israel had accepted the United Nations resolution on the partition of Palestine, it had been the Arab States which had replied with war and to say that the Arabs were expelled for religious reasons was a gross untruth. In May and June of the current year, the Arab States had again begun to foment fanatical hatred against Israel and to threaten it with total extermination. Mobs in Cairo were incited to kill in

the name of a holy war. She questioned whether the desire to live in peace, discuss, negotiate and settle outstanding differences represented aggression and imperialism as had been alleged. Vituperation, misrepresentation and the dissemination of hatred were the essence of intolerance whatever its focus.

52. There had been debate as to whether anti-Semitism was a manifestation of religious intolerance or of racial discrimination; in actual fact, it had become a combination of racist and religious intolerance. Since the instrument in question dealt specifically with religious intolerance, her delegation was prepared to consider the mention of "anti-Judaism" together with other manifestations of religious intolerance of a similar nature.

53. Israel was ready to assume responsibility for ensuring that all provisions of article III were implemented in its territory. She wondered whether the Arab States were willing to do likewise. She was surprised that the delegate of Iraq had seemed to object solely on the grounds that the representative of

Israel in the Human Rights Commission had been active in their foundation.

54. All citizens of Israel enjoyed freedom of faith; matters of personal status were under the authority of the ecclesiastical institutions which had exclusive competence on behalf of their own religions.

55. She drew attention to the fate of Jews in some Arab countries who had been murdered, burned to death, had their shops pillaged and liberties curtailed as Jews and not as Zionists during the recent hostilities.

56. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), speaking on a point of order, requested the representative of Pakistan not to exercise her right of reply.

57. Begum ISA (Pakistan) said that while she would have liked to reply to the Indian delegation's statement, she would respect the wishes of the Upper Volta representative.

*The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.*