



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Forty-sixth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 20 May 1969,
 at 3.15 p.m.



CONTENTS

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

President: Mr. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 14

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*) (E/4647, E/4671, E/L.1251):

- (a) Applications and re-applications for consultative status;
- (b) Review of non-governmental organizations in consultative status

World Jewish Congress (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT noted that the Council still had to take a decision on the status of ten non-governmental organizations. At the 1583rd meeting, it had begun its consideration of the World Jewish Congress, and the Soviet representative, supported by the delegations of the Sudan and Kuwait, had proposed that the organization in question should be removed from category II and not granted consultative status.

2. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the previous meeting the Sudanese representative had shown very convincingly that the world Jewish Congress, which was in fact nothing more than an extension of the World Zionist Organization, was engaging in activities which were incompatible with the possession of consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Zionist ideology, which was based on the doctrine of the chosen people and of racial superiority and which sought to gather together all the Jews who were scattered throughout the world, exploited anti-Semitic tendencies for the purpose of promoting immigration to Israel. The Sudanese representative had clearly described the manner in which Zionist organizations were encouraging Israel's expansionist tendencies and, in the role of allies of colonialism and imperialism, carrying on a campaign against liberation movements in those countries which had not attained independence. The World Jewish Congress, which had interfered in the internal affairs of many States Members of the United Nations, had organized a vast campaign of propaganda and slander in the Soviet Union on the pretext of protecting the Jews living in that country. Its activities could only be harmful to the atmosphere in which the United Nations carried on its work, and it should therefore not be granted consultative status.

3. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) expressed regret at the turn which the discussion was taking and at the fact that the Soviet representative saw fit to employ a style and language which should not have survived the Nazi era. The Council had to take a decision on four Jewish non-governmental organizations, and its task, leaving aside all political issues, consisted merely in determining whether the organizations in question met the criteria established by Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) of 23 May 1968. The most important of those criteria were set out in paragraphs 1-3 of the resolution: the organization had to be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Council; the aims and purposes of the organization had to be in conformity with the spirit, purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter; the organization had to undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities. Anyone who was familiar with the activities of the four organizations in question (World Jewish Congress, Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, Women's International Zionist Organization, Agudas Israel World Organization) was aware that they satisfied those requirements; they supported the work of the United Nations in the social, economic and human rights fields and had often made constructive proposals which had led to the adoption of resolutions, declarations and conventions.

4. The Soviet representative had said that the four organizations' consultative status should be withdrawn because they were political bodies in the pay of Israel. It was perfectly obvious that their members could not put aside completely the political views which they held; however, the main purpose of the organizations in question was not a political one, and they should not be confused with Zionist organizations concerned exclusively with work on behalf of Israel. Furthermore, as the Uruguayan representative had observed at the previous meeting, to forbid individuals and non-governmental organizations to express their views and to speak on behalf of oppressed minorities or victims of discrimination would in effect mean imposing censorship and thus permitting oppressors to act with impunity. If a non-governmental organization was not motivated by hatred and vindictiveness but rather by a sincere desire to bring about improvement in an unsatisfactory situation, it had a perfect right to express its views. It was in that spirit that a number of Jewish organizations had become concerned over the plight of the Jews in the USSR; however, their actions and motives had been misrepresented and they had been accused of interfering in the internal affairs of a Member State.

5. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would vote for the granting of consultative status to the four Jewish organizations in question, whose activities were in conformity with the principles set out in Council resolution 1296 (XLIV).


6. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation's position in the matter had not changed since the statement which he had made in the Security Council on 1 August 1966 in connexion with a border incident between Syria and Israel. At that time he had said that he would like to see both peoples working together to bring about a lasting peace.^{1/} As an Hispanic people, the people of Uruguay bore the imprint of Arab cultural, linguistic and racial influence. At the same time, he felt genuine admiration for the wandering people of Israel, which had undergone so much persecution and mistreatment. After the Second World War, during which millions of Jews had been tortured and killed solely because of their racial origin, the General Assembly had adopted a resolution creating the State of Israel, a resolution which in the minds of its sponsors implied no injury or offence to the sovereignty, feelings, religion or ideology of the Arab countries.

7. His delegation felt strongly that the Council should deal with the objective aspects of the question and avoid emotional reactions. He shared the views of the United States representative. The World Jewish Congress had been in existence for thirty-two years and had never received or requested contributions from any Government, while at the same time, like all non-governmental organizations, it had maintained informal relations with Governments reflecting political and economic systems of the most varied kinds. It should be noted that the independent, non-political nature of the Congress was proclaimed in its statutes. The Congress had dealt with matters which were within the competence of the United Nations, such as peace, disarmament and human rights. It had adopted resolutions which concerned countries with widely differing political systems.

8. The World Jewish Congress had been accused of interfering in the internal affairs of the USSR. However, the Congress had merely called upon the Soviet Government to grant Russian Jews the same religious rights as the members of other religions and to eliminate anti-Semitism wherever it existed. The resolution adopted by the Congress (see E/L.2/R.39/Add.7) had not constituted an accusation and had not been couched in offensive language. Prior to the resolution's adoption by the Congress, a commission of the Socialist International had made a similar appeal to the Soviet Government and the latter had not taken offence even though the resolution of the Socialist International had been more explicit and more outspoken than the one adopted by the World Jewish Congress.

9. The remarks made by the Sudanese representative had raised the question of whether the activities of leaders of a non-governmental organization ought to be confused with those of the organization itself. It was obvious that the head of a non-governmental organization should not engage in activities which were contrary to the aims and objectives of the United Nations Charter or to the criteria for admission to consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. However, there was nothing to prevent leaders of non-governmental organizations from engaging in activities in various spheres in an individual capacity.

^{1/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, 1293rd meeting, para. 29.

Contrary to what had been said by some representatives, Mr. Goldmann, the President of the World Jewish Congress, had never been the head of a Zionist organization, although he was the head of a number of Jewish organizations. 

10. He wished to state in conclusion that there was no reason to withdraw the consultative status of the World Jewish Congress or, for that matter, of the other three Jewish organizations, whose impressive accomplishments had a bearing on human rights, the struggle against racism and apartheid, and other matters. He thought it regrettable that the present question was producing such emotional reactions and hoped that subsequent speakers would follow his example and try to be as objective as possible.

11. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, said that he was concerned at the course the debate was taking. The Council's discussion was so charged with emotion that every statement was regarded as politically motivated and produced a flood of replies. While he did not wish to invoke rule 51 of the Council's rules of procedure, he asked if the President could not call upon representatives to restrict the length of their statements.

12. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that, while he appreciated the motives which had prompted the Tanzanian representative's statement, he thought it had come a little late. Other delegations had had an opportunity to express their views at length, and he felt that those who had yet to speak should have the same privilege.

13. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that he supported the Sudanese representative's statement. He did not agree with the Tanzanian representative's view that the debate was charged with emotion. On the contrary, he could state on the basis of his own experience that he had rarely heard in the United Nations a debate so marked by dignity, nobility and moral integrity. As to the length of the statements, he recalled that it had been agreed at the beginning of the session that delegations would have an opportunity to express their views on important questions.

14. The PRESIDENT confirmed the accuracy of the Kuwaiti representative's last remark but nevertheless requested speakers to be brief.

15. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that his delegation's position was based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and the relevant provisions of the Economic and Social Council resolutions regulating the granting of consultative status to non-governmental organizations, such as operative paragraph 2 of resolution 1297 (XLIV) of 27 May 1968, the last sentence of operative paragraph 17 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), and the first sentence and sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 36 of the latter resolution. The criteria set out in those resolutions should be applied to all non-governmental organizations which sought to obtain consultative status.

16. Zionism, a political movement based on the idea of racial superiority and hence of racial discrimination, had not only caused the separation of Jews and Arabs in Palestine but had also deprived the Arabs of their land. The Zionist organizations thus acted contrary to the provisions of the resolutions to which

he had referred and it was for that reason that his delegation had always opposed the granting of their applications.

17. The fact that the World Jewish Congress was a Zionist organization was demonstrated clearly by the report of the twenty-sixth Zionist Congress, which had been held at Jerusalem from 30 December 1964 to 10 January 1965, and by the report of the American Jewish Congress, from which he read out a number of extracts. He also wished to stress the links between the Zionist organizations and the State of Israel. The organizations in question were politically committed to Israel and against the Arab States. Their activities were thus contrary to the provisions of operative paragraph 36 (b) of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). Furthermore, the Zionist organizations sought to induce the United States Government to refuse entry visas to Arab students and supported the tours of United States universities undertaken by lecturers from Israel for propaganda purposes. The Zionist organizations intervened in the domestic affairs of States Members of the United Nations. They encouraged Jews to resist efforts at integration in the States in which they lived and reminded them that they owed allegiance to the State of Israel. The organizations in question thus imposed on Jews a double allegiance which weakened the structure of the States in which they lived. He did not think that such behaviour was compatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter. It was for that reason that his delegation requested that the Zionist organizations should be excluded from the United Nations and denied consultative status.

18. Mr. BABAA (Libya) said that he supported the Kuwaiti representative's remarks. The World Jewish Congress was not a non-governmental organization but the tool of the expansionist policy of the State of Israel, and it used religious pretexts to mask political aims. The World Jewish Congress was campaigning against certain Member States in contravention of operative paragraph 36 (b) of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). Zionism used anti-Semitism as a weapon to promote expansionism, annexation and deportation and accused anyone who opposed its political ambitions of anti-Semitism. The World Jewish Congress was working against the objectives of the United Nations, since it supported an expansionist policy which the United Nations had condemned. Furthermore, the Zionist organizations, in order to pay for arms purchases, were collecting funds in South Africa, a country whose racism, like that of Israel, was notorious. It was not a question of being influenced by a cultural heritage but of having the courage to decide who was right and who was wrong. His delegation would oppose the granting of consultative status to the World Jewish Congress.

19. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the representatives of the United States and Uruguay, who had referred to alleged discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, said that there was no discrimination of any kind against any social, ethnic or other group in the Soviet Union. The population of the Soviet Union comprised more than 110 different ethnic groups. The legal equality in all fields enjoyed by the citizens of the Soviet Union was implicit in the very nature of the socialist State, and

he therefore indignantly rejected the accusations made against his country. His delegation's arguments were based on the activities of the World Jewish Congress and the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). His delegation had been concerned with interest to the revelations of the representatives of Kuwait, Libya and the Sudan, and, since it wished to combat all racist trends, it would oppose the granting of consultative status to the World Jewish Congress.

20. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that the speakers who defended the Jewish organizations forgot to mention the sufferings inflicted on the Arab population of the Middle East by the Jews. They stressed the humanitarian aspect of the activities of Zionist leaders, but no one was deceived by what they said. According to *Who's Who in World Jewry*, Mr. Goldmann, the founder of the World Jewish Congress, was the president of several Zionist organizations and fully supported Zionist ideas by encouraging Jews from all countries to emigrate to Israel.

21. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) recalled that according to paragraph 17 of resolution 1296 (XLIV), which the Council had adopted unanimously, organizations accorded consultative status in category II because of their interest in the field of human rights should have "a general international concern with this matter, not restricted to the interests of a particular group of persons [or] a single nationality...". However, the reply of the World Jewish Congress to the Secretary-General's questionnaire (see E/C.2/R.39/Add.2) showed that that organization's aim was to strengthen the unity of the Jewish people and to protect the rights of Jewish communities throughout the world. Those activities were limited in scope and designed to protect the interests of a single nationality. For that reason his delegation would oppose the granting of consultative status to the World Jewish Congress.

22. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that several speakers had deliberately or inadvertently compared the World Jewish Congress, whose broad and world wide objectives were concerned with other than Zionist causes, with such organizations as the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency, which were Israel-based.

23. The PRESIDENT announced the closure of the debate. He invited the Council to vote on the proposal of the USSR, which had requested that consultative status should not be granted to the World Jewish Congress.

At the request of the representative of Kuwait, the vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Indonesia, Kuwait, Libya, Pakistan, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Argentina, Belgium, Chad, France, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstaining: Yugoslavia, Congo (Brazzaville), Guatemala, India, Turkey.

The proposal was rejected by 15 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

The World Jewish Congress was thus retained in category II.

Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations
(continued)

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Soviet proposal, supported by the Kuwaiti delegation (1582nd meeting), to transfer the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations from category II to the Roster.

The proposal was rejected by 16 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

The Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations remained in category II.

25. Mr. JHA (India) said he had thought that the vote related to another organization and he had intended to abstain.

Women's International Zionist Organization
(continued)

26. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Women's International Zionist Organization. The Kuwaiti delegation, supported by the Sudanese, Soviet and Libyan representatives, had proposed that the organization in question should not be granted consultative status (1582nd meeting).

27. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay), strongly supported by Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the Women's International Zionist Organization had been established more than fifty years ago - in other words, before Zionism had become a political movement. It was an organization of a purely religious nature, devoted to completely praiseworthy social activities, particularly for the benefit of women and children, and entirely non-political. It was represented in forty countries, and its work had attracted the attention of the United Nations Children's Fund. In 1965, the Committee of Soviet Women in Moscow had invited a delegation from the Women's International Zionist Organization to visit the Soviet Union, and the visit had been the occasion for an exchange of views on maternal and child welfare work.

28. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that Zionism had always been a political movement. Furthermore, Zionist organizations maintained a dubious relationship with Jewish organizations in South Africa. For example, leaders of those organizations had recently attended and spoken at a Jewish conference in South Africa. Certain Zionist organizations were also trying to influence political circles in order to tip the scales in favour of Israel in the Middle East crisis.

29. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that it was easy to play games with words; some organizations sought to conceal their true activities under the guise of an innocuous title. However, the Women's International Zionist Organization was well known as an active member of the World Zionist Organization.

30. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Kuwaiti proposal concerning the Women's International Zionist Organization.

At the request of the Libyan representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Guatemala, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Kuwait, Libya, Pakistan, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria.

Against: Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Sierre Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Argentina, Belgium, Chad.

Abstaining: Guatemala, India, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Congo (Brazzaville), France.

The proposal was rejected by 14 votes to 7, with 6 abstentions.

The Women's International Zionist Organization was thus included in category II.

Agudas Israel World Organization (continued)

31. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had decided to place the Agudas Israel World Organization on the Roster. The Uruguayan delegation, supported by the United States representative, had proposed that the organization in question should be transferred to category II (1582nd meeting).

32. Mr. BABAA (Libya), noting that a number of other religious organizations had been placed on the Roster, said that he saw no reason to challenge the decision taken with regard to the Agudas Israel World Organization.

33. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that the Agudas Israel World Organization had always been included in category II; he saw no reason for withdrawing that privilege, since the organization satisfied the requirements set out in Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) and had played a most useful role in the field of human rights. It was an initiative by the Agudas Israel World Organization, taken up by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which had led to the formulation of the draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. No reproach had ever been levelled at the organization, which had been known for more than twenty years for its work on behalf of refugees and for the numerous documents which it had published on the subject of human rights; the Council should therefore reconsider the decision which had been taken with regard to that body.

34. Mr. BABAA (Libya), supported by Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait), said that the activities of the Agudas Israel World Organization, as it described them itself in its reply to the Secretary-General's questionnaire (see E/C.2/R.38), did not meet the standards set by the Council in paragraph 17 of resolution 1296 (XLIV).

35. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he supported the Uruguayan representative's remarks. He recalled that the organization in question had made an important contribution to the drafting of the Convention on the Status of Stateless Persons, of 28 September 1954. Furthermore, in speaking out against discrimination on religious grounds, it had done

so not on behalf of Jewish communities but on behalf of all victims of religious intolerance throughout the world.

36. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the proposal to place the Agudas Israel World Organization in category II.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

37. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said he felt that the Council was spending too much time on the question of non-governmental organizations; it should not lose sight of the relative importance of the matters before it.

38. In voting on the status of the various organizations, his delegation had been guided by a number of considerations. On the one hand, considering it regrettable that the debate had caused such deep division in the Council, it had often preferred to maintain the status quo in order to avoid unnecessary complications which could only hamper the Council's work. On the

other hand, it had wished to be consistent; having voted in favour of a number of religious organizations such as the World Muslim Congress, the International Conference of Catholic Charities and the World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, it also voted in favour of category II status for the Jewish organizations. In any case, to take a fully informed decision would require lengthy study and the closest scrutiny of all those organizations' activities. The Economic and Social Council was neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly; it should concentrate on studying the matters before it and refrain from polemics.

39. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he fully endorsed the views of the representative of Upper Volta; he himself had been guided by logic and fairness in voting to grant consultative status to the organization on which a decision had just been taken.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.