



CONTENTS

Agenda item 22:	<i>Page</i>
Non-governmental organizations ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	77

*President:* Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia).

*Present:*

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Indonesia, Iran.

The representative of the following specialized agency: International Labour Organisation.

AGENDA ITEM 22

**Non-governmental organizations (E/2694 and Corr.1) (*continued*)**

APPLICATIONS AND RE-APPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS (E/2694 AND CORR.1)

1. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), speaking as the Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introduced the Committee's report (E/2694 and Corr.1), observing that it embodied two draft resolutions and an annex referring to points brought up by one delegation and giving the Committee's opinion thereon. The Committee had found Council resolution 288 B (X), paragraph 35 (a), somewhat ambiguously worded.

2. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee had acted unfairly in rejecting applications from the International Organization of Journalists, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the Fédération internationale des résistants. The procedure in the Committee, against which the Soviet Union delegation had protested at the time, had been strange, to say the least. The applications had been considered in a closed meeting, from which even the representatives of those organizations had been excluded, so that they had been unable to give fuller explanations of their formal applications. Furthermore, the Committee had failed to examine the applications in detail.

3. The World Federation of Democratic Youth, which had been in category B status from 1947 to 1950 and had been unjustifiably transferred to the Secretary-General's register in 1950 on the insistence of the United States delegation, had applied for a change of status. On a United States proposal, the Committee had rejected the application. The organization had been set up in London in 1945 during an international conference of democratic youth held immediately after the end of the war against fascism and attended by repre-

sentatives of more than sixty countries and of over 30 million young persons. Its aims had been defined as an effort to foster close collaboration and understanding among all young persons, to support Governments in the maintenance of peace, to eradicate fascism, to promote higher standards of living and freedom of the Press and of speech; it participated in international organizations and focused public attention on the interests of youth. It had held many international conferences, festivals, and sports and cultural meetings and was becoming increasingly popular. Special stress was laid on the interests of young workers. After giving details of gatherings of the organization in Prague, Bucharest and Warsaw, Mr. Saksin pointed out that the organization had currently a membership representing 85 million young persons of differing nationality, and political and social outlook in ninety-seven countries. The president was Italian, and the governing body included Australian, Brazilian, French and British young persons. It had shown an interest in the Council's work at the seventh, eighth and ninth sessions and could be very helpful to the Council. Its purposes and principles were in harmony with those of the United Nations as set forth in its Charter. He considered that the Committee should not have rejected its application.

4. The International Organization of Journalists, founded in London in 1941, had defined its post-war aims as early as October 1942; they had been on precisely the same lines as the United Nations Charter and the Council's field of work. The organization had continued to grow and in 1954 had welcomed members from five countries not previously represented. The total membership of the affiliated organizations was about 56,000, distributed over fifty countries, and there were about 1,200 individual members in twenty-eight countries. The organization could be of great use to the Council when dealing with freedom of information. He thought that the Committee had acted unadvisedly in rejecting its application.

5. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers had been founded in 1946 in Paris on the initiative of French lawyers who had been active in the Resistance movement. The objectives stated in its constitution included the promotion of peace and the eradication of fascism. It currently represented national associations in about forty countries. In 1953-1954 it had established national secretaries in several Latin-American countries. Five congresses had been held. At the fifth, in Berlin in 1951, matters pertaining to the national and international observance of human rights had been discussed. The organization embraced lawyers of the most varied views and could be very helpful to the Council. He considered that the Committee had been unwise to reject its application.

6. The Fédération internationale des résistants had applied merely for inclusion in the register. The organization was a union of those who had fought fascism, had been in a concentration camp or had been deported. It had been established at Vienna in 1951 and had mem-

bers in nineteen countries, including both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Through its national associations, the Fédération endeavoured to improve the social and economic situation of former Resistance fighters and victims of fascism and to promote peace. Its president was a distinguished figure of the French Resistance who had been interned in the Buchenwald camp and had led the rising against the SS there. The rejection of its application had been based on purely political considerations.

7. The Committee's rejection of the four applications showed that in closed session it was guided by political, not practical, motives. It had rejected them because certain circles in the United States of America disliked the activities of mass organizations fighting for international peace and friendship. On the other hand, it had conferred category B status on unimportant organizations like the International Thrift Institute, which could have only an indirect interest in the Council's agenda. In view of that situation, the Soviet delegation was submitting amendments (E/L.663) to draft resolution A in the Committee's report (E/2694 and Corr.1).

8. Mr. TSAO (China) repudiated the suggestion that the Council NGO Committee had been influenced in its consideration of applications for consultative status by any other considerations than the principles set out in Council resolution 288 (X). The applications of the organizations referred to by the Soviet representative had been carefully examined, and rejected on the general ground that the organizations existed largely for propaganda purposes.

9. Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia) welcomed the proposal for the granting of consultative status in category A to the World Veterans Federation. The Federation was genuinely international and had always played an important part in promoting the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations, in preventing aggression and eliminating the causes of war and fighting against race and class prejudice.

10. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) said that the Chinese Government was not represented in the Council.

11. He thought that the decision of the Council NGO Committee not to grant consultative status in category B to the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Organization of Journalists and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and not to place the Fédération internationale des résistants on the register was harmful and unjust. The decision would deprive the Council of the advice of organizations which had worked consistently to promote co-operation and understanding among nations.

12. The World Federation of Democratic Youth was the largest independent democratic youth organization in the world, bringing together young peoples from nearly one hundred countries. It existed for the defence of peace and the promotion of the economic, political, social, cultural and educational interests of world youth. Its activities were in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter and with the aims of the Council.

13. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers represented some forty countries and had correspondents in another twenty-eight. Its aims were

based on those of the United Nations itself, and in pursuing those aims it contributed to the fulfilment of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

14. The International Organization of Journalists represented newspapermen's associations and individual journalists in more than forty countries and was therefore one of the most truly representative of all international non-governmental organizations. Its aims were to maintain and strengthen world peace, to promote freedom of information and to combat war propaganda, race hatred and slanderous information. It supported the rights of colonial peoples and national minorities to have newspapers in their own languages.

15. The importance of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Organization of Journalists had been recognized in 1947 by the grant of consultative status in category B. The withdrawal of that recognition in 1950 had been an unjustifiable violation of an undisputed right.

16. The Fédération internationale des résistants had two and three-quarter million members in twenty countries. It fully supported the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and endeavoured to develop friendly relations among nations and to safeguard the dignity and worth of the human person. Its aims included the promotion of social welfare, public health, culture and education and the defence of fundamental human rights and freedoms.

17. He therefore urged the Council to reject the report of the Council NGO Committee (E/2694 and Corr.1), to adopt the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union (E/L.663) and to grant consultative status to the organizations which he had mentioned.

18. Mr. MENEMENCIOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation fully supported the report of the Council NGO Committee.

19. It concurred in the views of the Yugoslav representative on the World Veterans Federation and would vote in favour of the recommendation to place the Federation in category A consultative status.

20. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) and Mr. EPINAT (France) associated themselves with the Yugoslav representative's statement concerning the World Veterans Federation.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote separately on the operative paragraphs of draft resolution A in the Council NGO Committee's report (E/2694 and Corr.1) and on the USSR amendments (E/L.663) to it.

*It was so agreed.*

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A submitted by the Council NGO Committee (E/2694 and Corr.1).

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

23. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained because although his delegation was aware of the admirable work being done by the World Veterans Federation in various fields of the work of the Council, it felt that the number of organizations already in category A consultative status was adequate and should not be increased.

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR amendment (E/L.663, point 1) to paragraph 2 of the operative part.

*The amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

25. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 2 of the operative part of draft resolution A.

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

26. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR amendment (E/L.663, point 2) to paragraph 3 of the operative part.

*The amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

27. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 3 of the operative part of draft resolution A.

*Paragraph 3 was adopted unanimously.*

28. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR amendment (E/L.663, point 3) to paragraph 4 of the operative part.

*The amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

29. The PRESIDENT put to the vote successively paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of draft resolution A.

*Paragraph 4 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 5 was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 6 was adopted unanimously.*

*Paragraph 7 was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 8 was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

30. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution A submitted by the Council NGO Committee (E/2694 and Corr.1) to the vote as a whole.

*Draft resolution A, as a whole, was adopted by 16 votes to 2.*

31. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution B submitted by the Council NGO Committee (E/2694 and Corr.1).

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 16 votes to 2.*

32. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should invite Mr. Vincent Auriol, former President of France and at present Honorary President of the World Veterans Federation, who was in New York, to address the Council at the next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

33. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation maintained the views it had expressed concerning the World Veterans Federation when the question had been considered by the Council NGO Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.